John Adams
Library,
IN THE CUSTODY OF THE
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY.

SHELF No.
ADAMS
53.9
v.2

John Adams.

THE MISCELLANEOUS WORKS

Of the late REVEREND and LEARNED

CONYERS MIDDLETON, D. D.

Principal Librarian of the Univerſity of *Cambridge*.

Containing all his

WRITINGS,

Except the LIFE of *CICERO*:

Many of which were never before PUBLISHED.

VOL. II.

LONDON,

Printed for RICHARD MANBY on *Ludgate-hill*,
and H. S. COX in *Pater-noſter Row*.

M.DCCLII.

7717
14

X.V.
ADAMS
53.9
v.2

THE

CONTENTS.

I. *SOme Curſory Reflections on the Diſpute or Diſſenſion, which happened at Antioch, between the Apoſtles Peter and Paul.*

II. *Reflections on the Variations, or Inconſiſtencies, which are found among the four Evangeliſts in their different Accounts of the ſame Facts.*

III. *An Eſſay on the Gift of Tongues, tending to explane the proper Notion and Nature of it, as it is deſcribed and delivered to us in the Sacred Scriptures. And as it appears alſo to have been underſtood by the Learned both of the antient and modern Times.*

IV. *Some ſhort Remarks on a Story told by the Antients, concerning St. John the Evangeliſt, and Cerinthus the Heretic; and on the uſe, which is made of it by the Moderns, to enforce the Duty of ſhunning Heretics.*

V. *An Eſſay on the Allegorical and Literal Interpretation of the Creation and Fall of Man.*

VI. *A Letter to Dr. Waterland; containing ſome Remarks on his Vindication of Scripture: in Anſwer to a Book, intitled,* Chriſtianity as old as the Creation, *together with the Sketch or Plan of another Anſwer to the ſame Book.*

VII. *A Defence of the Letter to Dr. Waterland; againſt the falſe and frivolous Cavils of the Author of the Reply.*

VIII. *Some Remarks on a Reply to the Defence of the Letter to Dr. Waterland: wherein the Author's Sentiments, as to all the prin-*

cipal Points in Diſpute are fully and clearly explained in the Manner that has been promiſed.

IX. *Remarks on ſome Obſervations, addreſſed to the Author of the Letter to Dr. Waterland.*

X. *Remarks, Paragraph by Paragraph, upon the Propoſals lately publiſhed by Richard Bentley, for a new Edition of the Greek Teſtament and Latin Verſion.*

XI. *Some farther Remarks, Paragraph by Paragraph, upon the Propoſals lately publiſhed for a new Edition of a Greek and Latin Teſtament, by Richard Bentley, containing a full Anſwer to the Editor's late Defence of the ſaid Propoſals, as well as to all his Objections there made againſt my former Remarks.*

XII. *De Latinarum Literarum Pronunciatione Diſſertatio.*

XIII. *Dr. Middleton's Letters to Mr. Warburton, &c.*

SOME
CURSORY REFLECTIONS
ON THE
DISPUTE OR DISSENSION,
Which happened at
ANTIOCH,
Between the
APOSTLES *PETER* and *PAUL*.

AND

On the Variations alſo or Inconſiſtencies, which are found among the Four Evangeliſts, in their different Accounts of the ſame Facts;

In order to diſcover

What Light theſe Facts afford Us, towards illuſtrating the proper Notion of Inſpiration, or that Meaſure of it eſpecially which was indulged to the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, and how far they may be of Uſe if rightly interpreted, towards determining the Controverſies which have been raiſed concerning the Proofs and Evidences of the Chriſtian Religion, as far at leaſt as they depend upon the Prophecies of the Old Teſtament, which are cited for that Purpoſe in the New.

PRÆFACE.

SEVERAL of theſe pieces, which compoſe this Volume, were written by me many years ago; chiefly for my own information, on the occaſion of certain controverſies, then warmly agitated, concerning *the grounds and reaſons* of the Chriſtian religion; and eſpecially on the prophecies of the Old Teſtament, which are cited in the New, and applied to the particular acts and circumſtances of our Saviour's life. For when the enemies of revelation attempted to diſcredit thoſe citations, as being neither fairly made, nor rightly applied; and our Divines, on the other hand, had nothing to offer in the defence of them, in which a man of ſenſe could reaſonably acquieſce; I was willing to try, whether, from my own examination of the caſe, I might not be able to draw out ſomething more ſatisfactory; and if no ſolution of the difficulty could be found in the citations themſelves, whether it might not be drawn from the characters of the Evangeliſts, who made and applied them—for this topic, I knew, tho' intimately connected with the quæſtion, was, what none of our common Advocates would venture to touch upon: whoſe fortunes in the Church depend, not on ſeeking out what is true, but on defending what is eſtabliſhed; and on inventing expedients to puzzle, where they cannot confute an Adverſary. But truth, as the Antients tell us, lies buried in the deep, and cannot be diſcovered, but by ſearching things to the bottom: and when produced to the public view, ſhines always the brighteſt, after it has been poliſhed, as *Tully* ſays, by *the file of diſputation.*

As to the effect of my ſearches into the particular ſubject here intimated, it is fully explaned in the following ſheets. For tho' the controverſies, which gave birth to them, have long ſince been at an end, yet I flatter myſelf, that they may ſtill be ſeaſonable and ſerviceable, towards checking that ſpirit of diſaffection, which, in every part of the Kingdom, is viſibly exerting itſelf, againſt the eſtabliſhed religion, by all the various arts, which Popery, methodiſm and infidelity can ſupply: the growth of all which has of late years been greatly complained of by the Clergy. For as this increaſing evil is owing, partly to certain articles, publicly profeſſed and impoſed by our Church, which are juſtly liable to exception; and partly to groundleſs prejudices, and falſe notions of religion in general, conceived by the weak, and confirmed in them by the crafty; ſo it cannot poſſibly be cured by any other method, than by placing the common religion of Chriſtians on it's right foundation, the Goſpel, and clearing our particular ſyſtem of it from all juſt offence, and reducing it to it's original ſimplicity and conformity with the natural law or reaſon of man; which, in all quæſtions whatſoever, is the primary guide and ultimate teſt of right and wrong, truth and falſehood to the whole human ſpecies.

The Universal Law, the primary Guide and ultimate Test.

In the Heathen world, tho' there were always many Infidels and Heretics with regard to the eſtabliſhed religion, there were no Diſſenters from the eſtabliſhed modes of worſhip, and very little diſturbance given to the State by the intemperance of their religious conteſts: yet this was not owing to a want of zeal for the popular religion, in any order of men, for they all profeſſed the greateſt, but to a reaſonable way of thinking and acting with reſpect to it. The wiſer ſort were univerſally of opinion, that the multitude were to be deceived and allured to their duty, by fictions and fabulous tales, contrived to inſtill a ſuperſtitious reverence for the rites of their Anceſtors, and a firm belief of their divine origin. This therefore was the common principle of all the politer nations, and particularly of the antient Romans; whoſe religion ſeems, of all others, to have been the beſt calculated, to promote the general good and proſperity of the Republic [a]. But tho' they were perſuaded of the neceſſity of putting this deceit upon the populace, they thought it neceſſary at the ſame time, that the better ſort ſhould be treated in a different manner: with which view, while they injoined a ſtrict obſervance of their country's rites, as an indiſpenſable duty on all, they made no ſcruple, to laugh at the folly of thoſe, who took them for divine, and to publiſh their free ſentiments upon them without any reſerve; that all the liberal part of their fellow-citizens might underſtand, on what ground their religion ſtood, and by being of one mind, on a ſubject ſo intereſting, might live with more eaſe to themſelves, and good will towards each other.

That the Multitude were to be deceived; the common Principle of all polite Nations.

Thus in the writings of *Cicero*, *Varro*, and others, we ſee the moſt ſacred articles of their religion ridiculed with a freedom, which is apt to ſurprize us, till we reflect on the motives of it, and perceive, that it gave no ſcandal to men even of the ſtricteſt virtue and morality: for writings of this kind never reach to the multitude, or diſturb the courſe of the popular worſhip; being read onely by a few in compariſon, of a ſpecu-

Cicero Varro

---

[a] Hæc Pontifex (Scævola) noſſe populos non vult — expedire igitur exiſtimat, falli in religione Civitates, quod dicere etiam in libris rerum divinarum ipſe Varro non dubitat. Auguſt. de Civ. D. l. 4. c. 27.

lative and philoſophic turn; who reap no ſmall pleaſure, to find themſelves at liberty to think freely and rationally on ſubjects, which fill the minds of the vulgar with anxious ſcruples and ſuperſtitious fears.

Now as this conduct of the Heathens procured both peace and reverence to their falſe religions, ſo it may furniſh ſome uſefull hints for our conduct, with regard to the true one: whoſe ſuperior excellence and allowed divinity ſhould oblige us to guard it with the ſtricter care, from all mixture of human inventions. If any thing therefore of this ſort has ever been introduced into it, through the inadvertence, or political views of it's guardians; or any thing inſerted, out of condeſcenſion to popular prejudices, or a regard to the public quiet, which in ſome caſes perhaps may be reaſonable; it ought however to be ſo diſtinguiſhed and explaned, as to be underſtood, and treated agreeably to it's nature by men of ſenſe; not arbitrarily impoſed and enforced indifferently upon all, by the fictitious pretence of a divine authority.

For if the ſtudious and inquiſitive part of the nation, who ſearch and judge of things for themſelves, were made eaſy on theſe points, and allowed to think and ſpeak of the popular doctrines of the Church, what they find agreeable to fact and the teſtimony of their ſenſes, it would be the moſt effectual means of ſilencing thoſe uncharitable diſputes and diſſenſions, which are ſo frequent among us, on ſubjects generally ſo trifling, as to be unworthy of the zeal or attention of a Chriſtian, or ſo ſubtil and abſtruſe, as to be incomprehenſible to all, and unfit therefore, to be the objects of faith to any. The arbitrary impoſition of opinions naturally creates a reluctance to the reception of them; and as in the colliſion of bodies, ſo of minds, the repelling force is equal to that, which impells: but if opinions were propoſed to the public, with a latitude of interpretation, which left every one at liberty, to receive them according to his own ſenſe, and to embrace them either as true, or to acquieſce in them as expedient; it would cut off both the pretence, and the inclination to wrangle about them; and we ſhould enjoy them with the ſame eaſe, as we do the common air or water, take juſt as much of them, as we pleaſe, without offence or injury to any one elſe. By this means the virtuous and the liberal would become united in affection, as well as opinion, and live not onely with more charity towards each other, but by their example and moderation would lead the multitude alſo by degrees into more reaſonable notions of religious duties; ſo far at leaſt, as to prevent them from being ſeduced into any extravagance of zeal and principles, either Popiſh or Fanatical, which might create danger and diſturbance to the peace of the kingdom.

The chief argument, by which the Papiſts draw our people from us, is the authority of the Catholic Church, ſupported by a perpetual ſucceſſion of miracles, wrought in confirmation of thoſe very rites and doctrines, which are now taught and practiſed at *Rome*. In confutation of which, I have ſhewn in a former Volume, how that whole ſyſtem of worſhip, which we call Popery, and which diſtinguiſhes the religion of *Rome*, from that of Proteſtants, derived it's birth from Paganiſm, and the corruption of the primitive ages; was grounded on craft and fraud, and has been ſupported ever ſince by falſe and fictitious miracles. All which is ſo evident, from the cleareſt teſtimonies of antiquity, that it could not fail of extirpating Popery at once, out of every country, where it now prevails, if the power and policy of particular States did not find an intereſt in maintaining, what reaſon and religion jointly reject.

The other evil of Fanatical Enthuſiaſm, which has once overturned our whole conſtitution, and is now again at work towards the ſame end, is grounded chiefly on falſe notions, infuſed into weak minds, concerning thoſe extraordinary gifts and illuminations, which were conferred upon the Apoſtles and firſt converts to Chriſtianity; and, as theſe Enthuſiaſts alſo affirm, are ſtill indulged in a large meaſure to themſelves. Which extravagance I have endeavoured likewiſe to correct, in that ſame Volume, by ſhewing, that thoſe miraculous gifts of the Goſpel, of whatever kind they were, or for whatever purpoſes given, were peculiar to the circumſtances of the Apoſtolic times, and never afterwards granted to any ſucceding age: which ſame point I ſhall ſtill farther illuſtrate, in the preſent Volume, where I ſhall explane the nature of thoſe wonderful powers, in their original and moſt floriſhing ſtate; when they were exerciſed by the Apoſtles themſelves; which appears to be very little underſtood, or rather very much miſtaken by the generality of modern Divines; who, when preſſed by the Adverſaries of religion with difficulties, which they cannot readily ſolve, commonly take ſhelter under the authority of divine Inſpiration, and the neceſſity of an implicit ſubmiſſion to the teſtimony of God.

But as this way of reaſoning cannot be of any force with unbelievers, till the diſputants be firſt agreed, both in their notion of Inſpiration, and the certainty alſo of the fact, *that the Sacred writers were under the conſtant influence of it*; ſo to thoſe, who conceive either a different ſenſe of the word, or a different opinion of the thing, it is a mere *begging of the quæſtion*, and ſerves onely to weaken the evidence of our faith. My deſign therefore in this particular volume is, to correct the miſtakes which commonly prevail on this article of Inſpiration:

and to inquire how far the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts appear to have been favored with it, and to have acted under the immediate direction of an infallible ſpirit. In the illuſtration of which, I have not inſiſted ſo much on the texts of Scripture, which, by refined and forced conſtructions, may frequently admit a variety of ſenſes, and leave room for endleſs wrangling, as on the facts there recorded, which ſeem deciſive and demonſtrative of the point, into which I am inquiring.

For inſtance: no man, who is converſant with the New Teſtament, has ever ſcrupled to own, that before our Lord's Aſcenſion, the Apoſtles, generally ſpeaking, were in the condition of all other men, ſubject to frailty, error and ſin. For we find them ſometimes envying and reproving one another; ignorant of their maſter's purpoſe; blundering about his words and meaning; and out of fear at laſt deſerting and denying him. Which facts manifeſtly prove, that during this period of their Apoſtleſhip, they were not under the perpetual guidance of the Holy Ghoſt: tho', in the ſame interval, they were indued, on certain occaſions, with the miraculous power, of *caſting out Devils, raiſing the dead, and curing all diſeaſes.*

After our Lord's Aſcenſion, it is allowed again by all, that they were indued with a larger portion of the ſame divine gifts; by which their faith was confirmed, their underſtandings inlightened, their power of working miracles inlarged. But the quæſtion ſtill is, how far this larger meaſure of power reached, and whether to an abſolute infallibility and freedom from error: which muſt be determined by the ſame rule, by which we formed our judgement on the other period of their miniſtry; that is, by the facts and inſtances of their behaviour, delivered to us either by themſelves or the other ſacred writers. And if under this larger effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt, we find the ſame marks of frailty upon them, as before: if we find them differing from each other in points of fact, and ſometimes from themſelves in points of doctrine; quarrelling, diſſembling and temporizing, contrary to the truth of the Goſpel, we ſhall be obliged from the ſame premiſes to draw the ſame concluſion, that they were not under the continual direction of an unerring ſpirit, but left ſtill on ordinary occaſions to the condition of ordinary men.

This is what I have particularly ſet forth in the two following Inquiries by the evidence of facts and inſtances, which clearly demonſtrate it, when ſtripped of the gloſſes and forced interpretations, which Commentators had faſtened upon them in favor of their ſeveral ſyſtems and prejudices. And by the ſame method I have endeavoured alſo to explane, in a particular Eſſay, the genuin ſtate of the Gift of tongues, and all the other miraculous gifts, from the original hiſtory and effects of them, as they are deſcribed in the New Teſtament: from which it appears, that they were not permanent or laſting, but temporary onely, and adapted to ſpecial occaſions, and when theſe were ſerved, ſuſpended preſently or withdrawn from the perſons, who had been indued with them.

Such was the information, which I received, many years ago, from my inquiries into theſe ſubjects: which has appeared ever ſince ſo convincing to me, that I have been induced at laſt, to offer the ſame to the public; from a perſuaſion, that it may be of no ſmall ſervice to prevent, or to ſhorten at leaſt many of our diſputes; as well by admoniſhing the Advocates of our religion, not to build their defence of it on a foundation, that will certainly fail them, as by letting it's Adverſaries alſo ſee, that tho' we grant them the greateſt part of what their objections ſeem to aim at, the *genuin grounds and reaſons of Chriſtianity* will yet remain firm and unſhaken.

SOME
CURSORY REFLECTIONS
ON THE
DISPUTE or DISSENSION,
Which happened at
ANTIOCH,
Between the
APOSTLES *PETER* and *PAUL*.

THE hiſtory of this diſſenſion between the two Apoſtles; *St. Peter and St. Paul*, is related by *Paul* himſelf, in his Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, in the following Words.

Galatians

CHAP. II.

xi. *But when* Peter *came to* Antioch, *I withſtood him to the face, becauſe he was to be blamed.*

xii. *For before that certain men came from* James, *he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and ſeparated himſelf, fearing them, who were of the circumciſion.*

xiii. *And the other Jews diſſembled likewiſe with him, inſomuch that* Barnabas *alſo was carried away with their diſſimulation.*

xiv. *But when I ſaw, that they walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the Goſpel, I ſaid unto* Peter *before them all; if thou being a Jew, liveſt after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compelleſt thou the Gentiles, to live as do the Jews?* &c.

B 2

This fact is not mentioned in any other part of the New Teſtament: for *St. Luke*, who wrote the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, under the immediate direction of *St. Paul*, and deſcribes the actions of this Apoſtle more largely than of all the reſt, has not given the leaſt hint of it; ſo that it is difficult to determine the time when it happened. We read indeed of great numbers converted to the faith of Chriſt at *Antioch*, by the miniſtry of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and of very high debates ſubſiſting there, between the Jewiſh and Gentile converts, about the obſervance of the Moſaic rites [*a*]. But it is certain, that *Peter* was not concerned in thoſe debates; for *Barnabas*, who was now carried away by his authority into the ſame diſſimulation with him, was, at the time of thoſe other diſputes, a ſtrenuous Advocate for Chriſtian liberty, and being ſent up with *Paul* to *Jeruſalem*, to conſult the Apoſtles and Elders concerning this very quæſtion, found *Peter* there, the firſt and forwardeſt in that Council, to declare his opinion, which the reſt of them followed, *that ſince an end was now put to the difference between Jew and Gentile, they ought not to tempt God, by impoſing that yoak upon the Gentiles, which the Jews themſelves had not been able to bear* [*b*]. And in truth, all that we read concerning *Peter*, except in this ſingle inſtance related by *Paul*, is intirely conſonant to that declaration at *Jeruſalem*, and ſhews him, to have been more eminently convinced than the reſt of his brethren, of the utter abolition of the Jewiſh ceremonies. For this was ſignified to him by a particular revelation from heaven, in conſequence of which, he was the firſt, who opened the door of faith to the Gentiles, by baptizing *Cornelius* and his family [*c*]: And in the Council at *Jeruſalem*, was the mover of that opinion and Apoſtolic decree, by which the Gentile converts were ſet free from the Yoak of *Moſes*: Yet notwithſtanding all this conviction and zeal for Chriſtian liberty, we find him temporizing ſtill for fear of the Jews, and on that account openly accuſed of hypocriſy and prevarication by *St. Paul*.

[*a*] Acts xv. 1, 2.

[*b*] Ib. v. 7, 8.

[*c*] Acts x.

Porphyry.

It is certain however, that, from the earlieſt ages of the Church, this ſtory has been a conſtant topic of raillery to the Sceptics and unbelievers. *Porphyry*, the old enemy of our religion takes occaſion from it, " to charge *Paul* with aſſuming falſely to himſelf " the merit of facts, which never really happened, in order to " extoll his own character and depreſs *Peter*'s, out of envy to " his more eminent virtues: or allowing the fact to be true, to " accuſe *Paul* of inſolence and raſhneſs, in reproving his ſuperior " for a compliance, of which he himſelf was notoriouſly guilty: " or laſtly, to impute to both theſe great Apoſtles, a levity, in- " conſtancy, and weakneſs of mind, which betrayed them into " a conduct, unworthy of their ſacred character [a]."

Cephas.

Theſe objections were thought ſo diſhonorable to Chriſtianity by ſome of the antient Fathers, that many nice and ſubtil interpretations were invented to evade the force of them. One of the firſt, which was applied to this purpoſe, in thoſe primitive ages, was, the ſuppoſition of another perſon, of the name of *Cephas*, beſides the Apoſtle, one of the ſeventy Diſciples, eminent for his zeal and piety, with whom *Paul* had this diſpute. This is mentioned by *Euſebius*, on the authority of *Clemens of Alexandria* [b]: and it is obſerved by the Critics, that tho' we now find the name of *Peter* in all our preſent copies of this text, yet many of them, in the firſt ages, had *Cephas* in the place of it: for nothing could poſſibly give birth to the hypotheſis above mentioned, of a different perſon from the Apoſtle, but the name of *Cephas* in that place, which was inſerted probably for that very reaſon, of ſilencing the cavils of adverſaries [c].

---

[a] Locum dari Porphyrio blaſphemandi, ſi aut Petrum erraſſe, aut Paulum procaciter Apoſtolorum principem confutaſſe credatur. Hieron. Comment. in Ep. ad Galat. c. 2.

Ut blaſphemantis Porphyrii impudentiam coerceret; qui Paulum & Petrum puerili dicit inter ſe pugnaſſe certamine; immo, exarſiſſe Paulum in invidiam virtutum Petri; & ea ſcripſiſſe jactanter, quæ vel non fecerit, vel ſi fecerit, procaciter fecerit, id in alio reprehendens, quod ipſe commiſerit. Hieron.

[b] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 1. c. 12.

[c] Vid. Milii Edit. Nov. Teſtam. & not. in loc. *N. B.* As this reading of the Greek

But the ſuppoſition of another *Cephas*, diſtinct from the Apoſtle, of whom there was no mention in the Goſpel, nor any authentic account in hiſtory, was an argument too precarious to ſatisfy men of judgement: for which reaſon we find it diſclamed by ſome of the primitive Fathers. " We know no other *Cephas*, " ſays *Jerom*, but him, who, in the Goſpel and the Epiſtles, is " ſometimes called *Cephas* and ſometimes *Peter :* both which " names, the one *Greek*, the other *Hebrew* or *Syriac*, are of the " ſame import. And if on the account of *Porphyry*'s blaſphemy, " and leſt *Peter* ſhould be thought to have erred, we muſt pre" ſently feign another *Cephas*, we ſhall have work enough upon " our hands, in expunging numberleſs places of the holy Scrip" tures, which he finds fault with, becauſe he does not under" ſtand [*a*]."

St.

Greek text was contrived to clear *Peter*'s character from the blame here aſcribed to him, ſo we have another inſtance, in this ſame Chapter, of a ſimilar accommodation of the old Latin text, made to clear *Paul*'s character alſo from the charge of inconſtancy: by means of which the Greek and Latin Copies exhibited the 5th verſe in a ſenſe directly contrary to each other; the Greek, in that, which our Engliſh tranſlation follows;

To whom we gave place by ſubjection, no, not for an hour.

The Latin, without the negative particle;

To whom we gave way, by yielding to them for a ſeaſon.

Which laſt ſenſe is ſuitable indeed to the place, and what one would naturally expect from the verſe preceding, which ſeems to aſſign a reaſon for a temporary compliance of the Apoſtle: and it is agreeable alſo to fact and the real hiſtory of St. *Paul*'s conduct, from which it appears, that he did actually comply on certain occaſions, and yield for a time to the prejudices of the Jews, in order to appeaſe their reſentment againſt him. [*Acts* xvi. 3. xviii. 18. xxi. 26.] So that ſeveral of the antient Fathers preferred this reading and ſenſe of the text: but after this contrariety between the Greek and Latin copies had ſubſiſted through the ſeven firſt centuries of the Church, the authority of the Greek at laſt prevailed, as being more conſonant to the general doctrine and tenor of this Epiſtle.

Itaque aut juxta Græcos Codices eſt legendum, *quibus neque ad horam*, aut, ſi latini exemplaris fides alicui placet,—ſecundum ſuperiorem ſenſum accipere debemus, ut ad horam ceſſio, &c. Hieron. Comment. ad loc.

Rationibus certe iſtiuſmodi ductos puto, qui primi, jam inde ab ipſis Chriſtianiſmi primordiis, textum hunc corrupere, &c. Vid. Milii Edit. & Not. in loc.

[*a*] Quibus reſpondendum; alterius,

neſcio

St. Chryſoſtom ſhews likewiſe, from the circumſtances of the fact itſelf, that it muſt have been the Apoſtle *Peter*, who was concerned in it; becauſe no other perſon could have had authority enough, to draw the *Jews and Barnabas* alſo into his party. [a] Let us inquire then what were the ſentiments of theſe Fathers on this ſtory, and in what manner they interpreted it, ſo as to elude the calumnies of *Porphyry*.

Chryſoſtom.

Chryſoſtom, who makes it the ſubject of a Homily, preached by him in that very City, where it was tranſacted, takes great pains to ſhew, "that this ſeeming quarrel between the two Apo- "ſtles, was wholly feigned and diſſembled, and had been con- "certed beforehand between them with great art and prudence, "for the ſake of the converted Jews. For *Peter* knowing, that "he ſhould give much ſcandal to thoſe, who came from *Jeruſa-* "*lem*, as being more zealous and ſtiff in their prejudices than "the Provincial Jews, if he ſhould bluntly require them, to "quit the whole obſervance of their ceremonies, and live in "common with the Gentiles, choſe rather to comply with them "for a while, for the ſake of inſinuating himſelf the more "effectually into their favor and eſteem: but that he might draw "them and himſelf too the ſooner out of a compliance, which "he really condemned, he begged of *Paul*, to expoſtulate with "him for it very ſharply in public, that from his ſilence and pa- "tience under ſuch a reproof, the Jews might infer a tacit ac- "knowlegement of his error, and by obſerving, that he had "nothing to ſay, in defence of their conduct, might be con- "vinced, that it was not right, and ſo be induced to change "it."

All Simulation!

What Jesuits! What Macchiavilian Politilians, Chryſostom makes of both the Apostles!

Pauls Epistle another Simulation.!

This plot then having had it's effect in *Antioch*, St. *Paul*, according to *Chryſoſtom*, applies it here again to the benefit of the *Galatians*, and with the ſame view, with which he had before been an actor in it, he now gives a relation of it in writing;

---

neſcio cujus, Cephæ neſcire nos nomen, niſi ejus, qui in Evangelio, & in aliis Pauli Epiſtolis, & in hac quoque ipſa, modo *Cephas*, modo *Petrus* ſcribitur, &c. Hieron. ib.

[a] Homil. Oper. Tom. 3. p. 363. Edit. Benedict.

" diſſembling ſtill the real ſtate of it, that the *Galatians* perceiving how ſeverely *Peter* himſelf had been reproved, for his compliance with the ceremonies of the law, might be the more confirmed and reſolute in the rejection of them [a]."

Jerom

Jerom's opinion of this affair is much the ſame with *Chryſoſtom*'s; " that this quarrel was but a fiction contrived privately between the two Apoſtles, for the benefit of their new converts. " *Peter*'s commiſſion was more particularly directed to the Jews, " *Paul*'s to the Gentiles: And though both of them were " equally concerned and zealous to promote the common cauſe " of the Goſpel, yet each was more ſpecially obliged, to ſecure " the ſalvation of thoſe, who were ſpecially committed to his " care. Wherefore, as there were great jealouſies and conteſts " between the two factions of the Jewiſh and Gentile converts, " about the obſervance of the Moſaic rites, ſo it was concerted " by the Apoſtles, that *Peter*, in order to keep the Jews united " to himſelf and to the faith of Chriſt, ſhould outwardly declare " himſelf on their ſide, and pretend a zeal for their principles: " and leſt the Gentiles on the other hand, ſhould be drawn by " his authority to imitate his conduct, *Paul* was to oppoſe him " warmly in public, for the ſake of keeping his party likewiſe " intire, and preſerving his credit with them; ſo that, by their " mutual diſſimulation, both ſides might in the end be ſaved [b]. " This he illuſtrates by the example of the Lawyers, who ſeem " often to ſcold and quarrel with each other, when they mean " nothing more, than to deceive the by-ſtanders, and gain the " greater credit with their Clients, by an affected zeal for the " cauſe, which they have undertaken to defend [c]. If any one " thinks, ſays he, that *Paul* did really withſtand *Peter*, and out

like two Lawyers!

---

[a] Homil. Oper. Tom. 3. p. 363. Edit. Benedict.

[b] Sed, ut ante diximus, reſtitit ſecundum faciem publicam Petro: ut hypocriſis obſervandæ legis, quæ nocebat eis, qui ex Gentibus crediderant, correptionis hypocriſi emendaretur, & uterque populus ſalvus fieret, &c. — Unde & Paulus eadem arte, qua ille ſimulabat, ei reſtitit in faciem, &c. Hieron. Comm. in loc.

[c] Ut omiſſis ſæpe negotiis, in proprias contumelias verterentur, & joculari ſe invicem dente morderent, &c. ibid.

" of zeal for the truth of the Goſpel, did boldly inſult his ſuperior, he will not be able to account for *Paul*'s conduct, when " to the Jews he became a Jew, that he might gain the Jews; " who muſt be condemned of the ſame hypocriſy, when he " ſhaved his head at *Cenchrea*, and paid his vow on that occaſion " in the Temple, and circumciſed *Timothy*, the Son of a Gentile, " &c. — and with what face could he have the aſſurance, to condemn that in *Peter*, the Apoſtle of the Jews, which he himſelf was guilty of, tho' the Apoſtle of the Gentiles [a]?" Such were the ſentiments of *St. Jerom*, which he explanes at large in his commentary on the Epiſtle to *the Galatians:* but this ſolution of the matter was greatly cenſured by *St. Auſtin*, and gave occaſion to an Epiſtolary controverſy upon it, between theſe two great Doctors of the primitive Church.

Austin, thought it lying
and Perjury.

St. Auſtin charges it " with being nothing elſe, but a defence " of uſeful and ſeaſonable lying: and inſiſts, that if *Paul* knew " *Peter* to be innocent, at the ſame time when he declared him " to be blameable, and not to act according to the truth of the " Goſpel, it was in reality a lie: which it is impious, to charge " upon an Apoſtle; and eſpecially in an Epiſtle, where he calls " God to witneſs, that he does not lie. He ſhews alſo the pernicious conſequence of ſuch a doctrine, and that it would deſtroy the authority of the Scripture itſelf, by making it impoſſible to diſtinguiſh, between it's real and diſſembled meaning: " for the prevention of which evil, he exhorts *Jerom* to a recantation. As for his own part, he allows *Peter* to have been " blameable, yet not for continuing with his countrymen, to obſerve the traditions of their Anceſtors; which he might have

---

Jerom.

[a] Si putat aliquis vere Paulum Petro reſtitiſſe, & pro veritate Evangelii intrepide injuriam feciſſe Præceſſori; non ei ſtabit illud, quod & ipſe Paulus, Judæis Judæus factus eſt, ut Judæos lucrifaceret, & ejuſdem ſimulationis tenebitur reus, &c.— qua auctoritate, qua fronte audet hoc in Petro reprehendere, qui Circumciſionis Apoſtolus erat, quod ipſe, Apoſtolus Gentium, arguitur commiſiſſe. Hieron. Comm. in loc.

" done both innocently and conſiſtently, but for obliging the " Gentiles to obſerve them alſo in the ſame manner [a]."

Jerom

Jerom, on the contrary, perſiſted in his opinion, which he confirmed by many arguments, as well as the teſtimonies of all the beſt Interpreters before him; " challenging *Auſtin*, to produce " any one good author of a contrary ſentiment; and declaring, " that it would have been the greateſt impudence and audaciouſneſs in *Paul*, to reprove *Peter* ſo ſmartly for practices, of which " he himſelf was more eminently guilty. And as for *Auſtin*'s " opinion, concerning the expediency of obſerving the rites of " the Law, he treats it as a mere Hereſy, and the ſame, for " which *Cerinthus* and *Ebion* had been condemned by the " Church [b]."

Renowned Saints.

Vulgar hypothesis, that the Apostles could not err.

But notwithſtanding the great authority of theſe renowned Saints *Chryſoſtom* and *Jerom*, it is certain, that their interpretation of this ſtory is unnatural and abſurd; contrived to ſupport the vulgar hypotheſis, *that the Apoſtles could not err:* which they themſelves own to have been the ſole end and purpoſe of it [c]. *Auſtin* indeed comes nearer to the truth, in allowing *Peter to have been in a fault:* yet leſt the ſame ſhould be retorted alſo on *Paul*, with the addition of raſhneſs and inconſtancy, for condemning in his fellow-Apoſtle, what he himſelf practiſed afterwards, he has hit upon an expedient, which leſſens the crime of the one, and clears the other from any ſhare of it, by alledging; that *Peter*'s fault did not lie in his compliance with the Jewiſh rites, but *in impoſing the ſame alſo upon the Gentiles* [a]. An interpretation, neither agreeable to the particular ſenſe of that Epiſtle, nor to the general doctrine of the Apoſtles; which expreſsly annulls all the ceremonies of the Law, not onely as uſeleſs, but as noxious to all Chriſtians whatſoever, as well of Jewiſh, as Gentile extraction; and which *Jerom* therefore treats, as nothing better than Hereſy.

---

[a] Patrocinium mendacii ſuſceptum eſſe, vel a te tali viro, vel a quopiam, ſi alius iſta ſcripſit; fateor non mediocriter doleo, &c. Epiſt. Auguſt. ad Hieron. Oper. Hieron. T. 4. par. 2. Ep. LXV. p. 602.

Arripe, obſecro te, ingenuam & vere Chriſtianam ſeveritatem & *παλινωδίαν*, ut dicitur, cane. Ibid. Ep. LXVII. p. 606.

παλινωδίαν cane.

Quapropter non ideo Petrum emendavit, quod paternas traditiones obſervaret, quod ſi facere vellet nec mendaciter nec incongrue faceret —Sed quoniam gentes cogebat Judaizare, &c. ibid.

[b] Quum me erroris mei multos ſocios habere perſpexeris, tu veritatis tuæ ſaltem unum adſtipulatorem adferre debebis — Hæc eſt ſumma ſententiæ tuæ, ut poſt Evangelium Chriſti benefaciunt Judæi credentes, ſi legis mandata cuſtodiant —ſi hoc verum eſt, in Cerinthi & Ebionis hæreſim delabimur. Ibid. Ep. 74.

Jerom

[c] Quod ſi cui iſte non placet ſenſus, quo nec Petrus peccaſſe, nec Paulus procaciter arguiſſe majorem oſtenditur. Hieron. in Gal. ii. It. Chryſoſt. T. 3. p. 363. Edit. Bened.

The modern Commentators, who for the moſt part do little more than copy the Antients, range themſelves here generally on the one ſide and the other, under *Jerom* and *Auſtin*. Some indeed take no notice at all of this paſſage; either finding nothing to ſay upon it, that pleaſed them, or fearing perhaps to give offence, by ſaying what they found to be true. *Eraſmus* obſerves, that it is a very difficult place, and had puzzled the moſt learned of the Greeks, how to explane it: and as he thought fit on this occaſion to adhere to the common hypotheſis, *that the Apoſtles, after they had once received the Holy Ghoſt could not err in points of doctrine*; ſo he follows the explication of *Chryſoſtom*, and improves ſtill upon it, by ſtraining the words of the text, as ſome other Critics have alſo done, ſo as to make them ſignify even to *the Galatians*, that the diſpute was wholly feigned and concerted between the two Apoſtles. For the words, which we rightly tranſlate; *I withſtood him to the face, becauſe he was to be blamed*; they interpret thus; *I withſtood him ſeemingly, or in outward appearance, becauſe he was blamed by ſome, who did not underſtand the reaſon of his conduct* [b]. But they do not reflect, that this forced interpretation is contrary to the whole argument of this Epiſtle, the purpoſe of which is, to move the *Galatians* by his own example, to ſtand firm in their Chriſtian liberty, againſt thoſe falſe

Erasmus.
A great difficulty: because the Apostles could not err.

The Dispute feigned and concerted.

Oh! Erasmus!

---

[a] Non quia ſervabat conſuetudinem Judæorum, ſed quia Gentibus eam volebat imponere. Aug. Expoſit. in Gal. ii. 11.

[b] Certe locus eſt obſcurus, qui doctiſſimos Græciæ magnopere torſeſit. — Sed Apoſtolos, poſt acceptum Spiritum Sanctum, erraſſe in dogmatibus fidei, mihi videtur dictu impium, &c. Vid. Eraſm. in Galat. ii. 11, 14. vid. it. Clarium. ib. v. xi.

locus obscurus.

Erasmus. What is the deffinition of the Word "Impium"?

teachers, who were attempting to impoſe *the Yoak of Moſes* upon them. If in this place therefore, as theſe interpreters contend, he meant to ſignify, that, when he withſtood *Peter* ſo warmly, he was acting onely a feigned part, that would deſtroy the force of his own reaſoning.

Grotius accommodates.

Grotius, tho' generally ſpeaking the moſt rational of the Commentators, yet in this paſſage, ſeems to have been affected with the popular prejudice, or unwilling at leaſt, out of regard to it, to declare his own ſentiments with freedom. For by mitigating the fault of *Peter*, and ſoftening the harſhneſs of *Paul*'s cenſure upon him, he labors to dreſs up the whole, into the caſe onely of an amicable debate, or friendly expoſtulation, about a thing in itſelf indifferent; which, to ſay nothing of the reſt, the fourteenth verſe will by no means bear [a].

On the whole, we may obſerve; how impoſſible it is for men even of the greateſt learning and piety, to interpret Scripture with ſucceſs, when they come to it prepoſſeſſed with ſyſtems, which they are liſted as it were to defend, as neceſſary parts of the Chriſtian religion; for inſtead of ſearching candidly for the true meaning of the text, they come provided with ſenſes, which they are obliged to ingraft upon it; till by a practice and habit of wreſting the Scripture on all occaſions, they acquire a dexterity of extracting what doctrines they pleaſe out of it.

The caſe now before us affords a remarkable inſtance of it. There is not a fact in all the Scriptures, more clearly, expreſsly, and intelligibly delivered than this, into which we are inquiring: and if it were found in any other book but the Bible, or told of any other perſons, but the Apoſtles, it would be underſtood at once, without the poſſibility of a miſtake, by all, even of the loweſt capacity. Yet this plain ſtory, related in a book, which above all others, is calculated for the univerſal inſtruction and benefit of mankind, has puzzled both the Greeks, and the Latins of all ages, and been ſtrained and tortured by the ableſt Doctors of the Church, for the ſake of ſqueezing out of it every poſſible ſenſe, but the true one. For which no other cauſe can be aſſigned but this; that in the degeneracy of the Primitive Church, when by the policy or ſuperſtition of it's leaders, new rites and doctrines were introduced, which the text of Scripture diſclamed; then reaſon and ſenſe were of courſe diſcarded, and no rule of interpreting admitted, but what tallied with the faſhionable ſyſtems, and ſerved the views of thoſe, who introduced them.

---

[a] Ἀντέστην, hic intelligendum verbis amicis, &c. Grot. ib. v. xi.

Degeneracy of the primitive Church.
New rites and doctrines discarded Reason and Sense.

I ſhall procede therefore, without any farther regard to the prejudices and interpretations either of the antients or moderns to ſet forth the real ſtate of this fact, as it is declared by St. *Paul*, and illuſtrated by other paſſages of the New Teſtament.

It is manifeſt then in the firſt place, that *Peter*, tho' more particularly the Apoſtle of the Jews, was clearly convinced, that the Ceremonies of the Law were ſuperſeded and aboliſhed by the Diſpenſation of the Goſpel. For on all occaſions, we find him ſtrongly aſſerting this doctrine, and declaring, that *the Yoak of Moſes* ought not to be impoſed on the necks of Chriſtians: yet with all this conviction, it is equally manifeſt, that through fear of the Jews, he was induced, as we have ſeen above, to change his conduct, diſſemble his opinion, and join himſelf to thoſe Zealots of the Law, who required the obſervance of it's rites, as neceſſary ſtill to all [a].

Peter dissembled

Paul, on the other hand, the Apoſtle of the Gentiles, and, by that character, the more engaged to vindicate their liberty, knowing *Peter*'s ſentiments on this quæſtion to be really the ſame with his own, was ſo ſcandaliſed at his diſſimulation, that he could not abſtain from reproaching him very ſeverely for it in public: yet when it came afterwards to his own turn, to be alarmed with an apprehenſion of danger from the ſame quarter, he was content to comply and diſſemble too, and in order to pacify the Jews, af-

Paul reproached him
and afterwards dissembled himself.

---

[a] See Cave's Life of St. Pet. §. viii. c. 7. it. Archbiſhop Wake on the Epiſt. of Barnabas, c. x, xi. p. 65.

Timens ergo eos ſegregabat ſe a gentibus, & ſimulate illis conſentiebat, ad imponenda Gentibus illa onera ſervitutis. Auguſt. in Galat. ii. 11.

fected a zeal for their legal rites and obſervances, by the advice of *James*, who then preſided in the Church of *Jeruſalem* [*a*]. *Paul*, ſays *Chryſoſtom*, *was various both in his words and actions*; *at one time he complied with the ceremonies of the Law*; *at another he contemned them*: *at one time he ſacrificed and ſhaved his head*; *at another he denounced anathema's againſt all, who did ſo*: at one time he circumciſed, *at another rejected all circumciſion* [*b*].

by the advice of James.

Paul various in Words and Actions.

We may obſerve however by the way, that the conduct of *Paul* was not ſo guarded and cautious as that of *Peter*, who ſeems to have better underſtood the true Spirit of his Countrymen, and to what extravagance their enthuſiaſtic zeal would carry them, if provoked and puſhed to extremity: he recollected that they had ſtoned *Stephen*, for declaring, *that Jeſus came to change thoſe cuſtoms, which Moſes had eſtabliſhed*, and he took care therefore, to give way to them in time, when his compliance was likely to prevent the danger, which he apprehended: whereas *Paul* had carried his zeal for Chriſtian liberty ſo far, and declared himſelf every where ſo roundly againſt the ceremonies of the law, both by preaching and writing, that when he was driven afterwards to a change of conduct, his diſſimulation proved too late, and inſtead of pacifying the Jews, provoked them onely the more; ſo that they laid violent hands upon him in the Temple, and would certainly have deſtroyed him, if the Chief Captain had not come to his reſcue with a band of ſoldiers [*c*].

Peter more cautious than Paul.

Stephen stoned,

And Paul would have been for preaching the same doctrine the abolition of the Law of Moses.

This is the true ſtate, of the caſe, as it may clearly be collected from ſeveral paſſages of the New Teſtament: and whatever uſe the enemies of religion can make of it, they muſt enjoy it, ſince Chriſtianity cannot be defended, either by denying or conceling the truth. Let the diſciples then of *Porphyry*, after the example of their maſter, object to us if they pleaſe, that theſe two Apoſtles, of whoſe extraordinary gifts and miracles we read ſo much, were left on many occaſions, like all other frail and fallible

Infidels may make the most of it. But this cannot be much.

[*a*] Acts xxi. 18.

[*b*] Chryſoſt. Oper. T. 2. Homil. de laudib. Pauli. p. 502. Edit. Benedict.

[*c*] Act. xxi. 31.

lible men, to govern themſelves by rules and maxims merely human, and were betrayed ſometimes by their paſſions, into compliances, diſhonorable to their character: for ſhould we grant them all this, it cannot be of any hurt or diſcredit to Chriſtianity, unleſs they could ſhew it to be one of it's doctrines, that perſons extraordinarily illuminated and inſpired on certain occaſions, did on all occaſions ceaſe to be men: which will not be pretended in a religion, whoſe ſacred monuments, both of the Old and New Teſtament, furniſh many inſtances of the ſins and frailties of thoſe, who are there celebrated, as the principal favorites of heaven.

Here Speaks a Man of Sense and Honor.

The Apostles did not always cease to be Men. Nor did Moses, David, Solomon or Job.

It may be objected ſtill farther, that, whatever notions we may entertain concerning the inſpiration of the ſacred writers, it is evident from this very caſe, that the Apoſtles and firſt Preachers were not conſtantly inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, even in the execution of their miniſtry, and the propagation of the Goſpel, in one of the principal Cities of the Eaſt: and this too muſt neceſſarily be granted, ſince it is demonſtrably proved by the fact, into which we are inquiring: for if *Peter*'s conduct was really blameable, we muſt neceſſarily allow, that he was not at that time under the guidance of an unerring Spirit; or if it was not blameable, then *Paul*'s cenſure of him was raſh and unjuſt, and could not be ſuggeſted by the ſame Spirit.

The Apostles not constantly inspired, even in the execution of their Ministry.

The ſame concluſion may be drawn from many other paſſages of the New Teſtament; from *Paul*'s behaviour before the High Prieſt, where he was guilty of a rudeneſs and indecency, which he himſelf condemns [*a*]: from his ſharp contention with *Barnabas*, who had been joined in commiſſion with him by the Holy Ghoſt, and was extraordinarily inſpired by the ſame Spirit: *which could not have happened*, ſays *Eraſmus*, *without ſome fault, on the one ſide or the other.* Their quarrel was about *Mark*, ſuppoſed to be the ſame, who wrote the Goſpel; whom *Paul* looked upon as a deſertor, and would not keep company with any longer;

Paul rude

Quarrel with Barnabas about Mark

[*a*] Acts xxiii. 5.

but *Barnabas* had a different opinion of him, and choſe him for his aſſociate; upon which they parted in anger from each other [*a*]. *Paul* on this occaſion *was more ſevere*, ſays *Jerom*, *Barnabas more mild*; *both of them abound in their own ſenſe*; *yet the quarrel has ſomething in it of human frailty* [*b*].

Both abound in their own Sense! i.e. both are Self conceited and Self Sufficient.

It appears alſo, from the account of theſe diſputes in the Church of *Antioch*, that theſe ſame Apoſtles, who planted Chriſtianity in that City, had never made any pretenſion to an infallible Spirit, nor their converts, who paid the utmoſt reverence to their perſons, had ever entertained a thought of aſcribing it to them. For we find, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* had not authority enough with them, to put an end to their contentions about the exerciſe of the Jewiſh ceremonies, till they were ſent on a formal embaſſy to *Jeruſalem*, to receive the judgement of the whole aſſembly of the Apoſtles and Elders reſiding there, on the ſubject of their diſputes.

Infallibility not pretended nor believed.

As it is certain then, from many teſtimonies of the New Teſtament, that the Apoſtles and firſt Preachers of the Goſpel were indued occaſionally with extraordinary powers and ſupernatural aſſiſtances by the Holy Ghoſt; ſo it is as certain, from other teſtimonies, that they were not perpetually aſſiſted in the ſame extraordinary manner, but frequently left, like common men, to regulate their conduct by their own natural prudence [*c*].

We

[*a*] Acts xv. 12, 39. Quod fieri non potuit niſi alterutro errante. Eraſm. in loc. it. in Matt. ii. 6.

[*b*] Paulus ſeverior, ille clementior: uterque in ſuo ſenſu abundat: tamen diſſenſio habet aliquid humanæ fragilitatis. Hieron. Oper. T. 4. par. 2. p. 522.

Il abonde dans son Sens. L. Vergennes.

[*c*] The caſe appears to have been the ſame alſo under the Jewiſh Diſpenſation; that the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit, did not perpetually reſide in thoſe, to whom they had once been communicated. For example; *Samuel*, when he was ſent to anoint a King over *Iſrael*, out of the family of *Jeſſe*, did not know the particular perſon, to whom his commiſſion was addreſſed, but, upon the ſight of *Jeſſe*'s ſons, as they were produced before him, did, what all other men would naturally do; gave the preference in his own mind to him, who by the ſuperior comelyneſs of his perſon, ſeemed the beſt qualified to ſuſtain the Regal dignity; till he was convinced of his miſtake by a ſpecial revelation, and directed to *David*, whom God had deſtined to that honor. [1 *Sam*. xvi. 6.]

Thus

We read ſometimes, how the Prophets alſo of the Old Teſtament, as well as the Preachers of the New, were indued with a miraculous vigor of body, far above the force of nature; ſo as to perform great journeys without fatigue, great faſtings, without hunger, and ſupport life, without the ſupply of it's ordinary food; yet at other times, the ſame men were ſubject to all the common wants and infirmities of nature; to hunger and thirſt; to pain and ſickneſs; to age and decay. The caſe was the ſame with the faculties of their minds; whenever God thought fit to make uſe of their miniſtry, for the extraordinary purpoſes of his Providence, he inlarged and inlightened their underſtandings, and inſpired them with a knowledge, incapable of error: yet at other times, left them wholly deſtitute of any ſupernatural aſſiſtance, and liable to all the effects of their natural paſſions. It is as extravagant therefore, and contradictory to the teſtimony of Scripture, to believe the prophets and Apoſtles to have been at all times incapable of error, becauſe they were ſometimes guided by an unerring Spirit; as to imagine, that they were always exempted

Neither Prophets nor Apostles at all times infallible. Can this want proof?

Thus alſo, when *David* had taken a reſolution, to build a Temple to the Lord, the Prophet *Nathan*, whom he conſulted upon it, approved the project without any heſitation, and encouraged him to execute it. But in that ſame night, he was ordered by a ſpecial revelation from God, to go back to the King, with a command to him, to deſiſt from his deſign. [2 *Sam.* vii. 3. 1 *Chron.* xxii. 8.]

Nathan

Thus again, when the *Shunamite* woman addreſſed herſelf, in a paſſionate manner, to *Eliſha*, upon the death of her Son, the Prophet ſurprized at her diſtreſs, declares, *that God had hidden the matter from him*, and ſeems anxious, to know the cauſe of her great affliction. [2 *Kings* iv. 27.] Laſtly, from the tranſaction between the *two Prophets, at Bethel*, it is evident, firſt, that their divine Inſpiration or Commiſſion was limited to particular purpoſes, beyond which it had no effect: 2dly, that Prophets, tho' inſpired and employed by God on ſome occaſions, yet on others, might be guilty not onely of weak but bad actions. [1 *Kings* c. xiii.] agreeably to which facts, *Grotius* obſerves, that the Prophetic Spirit was but ſeldom reſident in the Prophets, juſt as God thought fit; nor were the Prophets certain, at what time they were to have it: of which we ſee inſtances, in *Nathan*, *Samuel*, *Iſaiah*, [*Acts* ii. 3.] Dr. *Lightfoot* alſo ſays, that tho' their power was great, they could neither do nor tell all things, nor act on all occaſions, but always had their bounds, and ſometimes a receſs of the Spirit, or a departure of it from them.

Elisha.

Grotius

Lightfoot.

from fatigue, or hunger, becauſe the effect of thoſe ſenſations was ſometimes miraculouſly ſuſpended in them.

Erasmus

Eraſmus, tho' in ſome places he ſeems diſpoſed to ſupport the vulgar hypotheſis, *that the Apoſtles could not err*; and like all other Commentators, endeavours, by forced conſtructions, to adapt the ſenſe of Scripture to that ſyſtem; yet, in other places, where, like a true Critic, he delivers his ſentiments with freedom, he expreſly aſſerts, what I have here advanced; that the Apoſtles, on ordinary occaſions, were not different from ordinary men, but ſubject to ignorance and error; and from the caſe of this very diſſenſion between *Paul* and *Peter*, ſhews, *that they were capable of erring, even after they had received the Holy Ghoſt* [a]. The learned Mr. *Dodwell* alſo declares, " that neither the Apoſtles, nor " the Prophets even of the firſt order, were perpetually inſpired, " or had the miraculous gifts of God at their command; and that " all things therefore, which they have ſignified to us by their " words or deeds, are not to be conſidered as divine Oracles [b]. " There never was a Prophet, ſays he, except Chriſt, who, in " all his actions, was directed by a prophetic Spirit; nor ever " any, who was not liable to human errors, where he was " guided onely by his own human Spirit. *Barnabas* erred, " *St. Peter* alſo erred, and *St. Paul*, an Apoſtle not inferior to " him, affirms him to have erred, tho' they were indued " with the Apoſtolic, or the very higheſt degree of the extra" ordinary gifts [c].

Dodwell

Christ excepted.

Erasmus inconsistent.

---

[a] Eraſm. in Act. x. 38. Etiam poſt acceptum Spiritum Sanctum, objurgatur ac docetur Petrus a Paulo: Paulus a Barnaba diſſentit uſque ad divortium.

[b] Dixeram — ne quidem Apoſtolis, aut ſummi ordinis Prophetis fuiſſe ad nutum aut pro arbitrio ſuo, divini Numinis afflatus; nec adeo omnia, quæcunque dictis ſignificarunt aut factis, ea pro divinis oraculis habenda. Præf. in Diſſ. Iren. §. ii.

[c] Nullus, excepto Domino, fuit unquam Propheta, qui omnia egerit Spiritu prophetico. Nullus, qui in iis, quæ ſuo geſſerit humano ſpiritu, non fuerit etiam erroribus obnoxius humanis. Erravit Barnabas: Erravit etiam S. Petrus, eumque erraſſe confirmat, non minor Apoſtolus, S. Paulus, ſupremo licet extraordinariorum donorum gradu Apoſtolico præditi. Diſſ. Iren. 2. §. iii. p. 95.

Some zealots indeed, on the other hand, contend; that to give up the perpetual inſpiration of the ſacred writers, is to betray the cauſe of Chriſtianity, and to give up the authority of the Scriptures themſelves; and that there is a neceſſity to admit or reject the whole, as divinely inſpired; ſince partial inſpiration will be found equivalent in the end to no inſpiration at all. And this indeed is the general doctrine of thoſe, who aſſume to themſelves the title of orthodox: but it is ſo far from being of ſervice to Chriſtianity, that it has always been, and ever will be, a clog and incumbrance to it, with all rational and thinking men: and to impoſe it, as neceſſary to the Creed of a Chriſtian, and on the authority of thoſe ſacred books, in which every one may ſee the apparent marks of human frailty, not onely in the ſtile and language, but ſometimes alſo in the matter of them, can have no other effect, but of reducing us to the dilemma of diſtruſting either thoſe books, or our ſenſes.

Zealots

orthodox! Who can be orthodox.?

But this notion is not onely inconſiſtent with the facts abovementioned, but contradictory even to thoſe very writers, to whom it is aſcribed: for it is certain, that the Evangeliſts make not the leaſt pretenſion to it, and the Apoſtles on ſome occaſions expreſsly diſclame it [a]. *St. Paul*, in this ſame Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, ſays, *I ſpeak after the manner of men.* On which *St. Jerom* obſerves, " that he makes good what he ſays, and by his low and " vulgar way of reaſoning, might have given offence to under- " ſtanding men, if he had not prefaced it, as he does, by ſigni- " fying, that he was delivering onely his own human ſenti- " ments [b]."

St Paul, according to Jerom talks like a mere Man.

And as this Apoſtle was ſometimes deſtitute of the divine aſſiſtance, in the explication of particular doctrines, ſo it is as evident alſo, that, on other occaſions, he was deprived of the power of working miracles.

---

[a] 1 Cor. vii. 12, 25. 2 Cor. xi. 17. Rom. iii. 5. vi. 19.

[b] Gal. iii. 15. Unde manifeſtum eſt, id feciſſe Apoſtolum, quod promiſit; nec reconditis ad Galatas uſum eſſe ſenſibus, ſed quotidianis & vilibus, & quæ poſſent, niſi præmiſiſſet *ſecundum hominem dico*, prudentibus diſplicere. Hieron. Comment. in loc. Oper. T. 4. p. 261.

Jerom

The Apostles could not always raise the dead not cure the sick. At least they did not.

Trophimus left sick, when much wanted.

The Apoſtles, ſays *Eraſmus*, did not *always raiſe the dead*; did not *always cure the ſick*; but then onely, when the cauſe of religion and of the Goſpel required it [*a*]. *St. Paul* acquaints *Timothy, that he had left Trophimus behind him ſick*, on his journey towards *Rome*; at a time when he moſt wanted the comfort and aſſiſtance of his friends; being deſerted, as he complains, by ſome of them, and forced to ſend others to the work of the miniſtry: and it cannot be ſuppoſed, that in ſuch a diſtreſs, and want of attendants, he would have left his diſciple and companion in that ſick ſtate, if he had been indued at that time, as we find him to have been at others, with a miraculous power of healing diſeaſes [*b*]. In ſhort, this notion of the univerſal inſpiration of the Apoſtles and ſacred Writers, appears to have no other foundation; but in the miſtaken ſenſe of certain texts, ſuggeſted by the prejudices of pious men, who greedily embrace an hypotheſis, which ſeems to advance the honor of religion, and furniſhes, at the ſame time, the ſhorteſt and eaſieſt method of ſilencing all objections to it, by the infallible authority of perſons inſpired by God. But this ſame quæſtion will be more clearly and largely illuſtrated in my next inquiry.

Erasmus,

[*a*] Non ſemper excitabant mortuos, non ſemper ſanabant ægrotos, ſed tum demum, cum ad religionis & Evangelii negotium pertinebat. Eraſm. in Act x. 38.

Epaphroditus, dangerously sick to the great Grief of the Apostle and the Philippians.

[*b*] 2 Tim. iv. 20. *Epaphroditus* alſo, whom *St. Paul* calls *his brother and companion in labor, and fellow-ſoldier*, is ſaid to have been dangerouſly ſick, and *nigh unto death*, to the great grief of *the Apoſtle and of the Philippians* alſo, to whom he ſent him with his Epiſtle, ſoon after his recovery. [*Philip.* ii. 25.] And in the caſe likewiſe of *Timothy*, inſtead of confirming his health by his miraculous power over all diſeaſes, we find *Paul* adviſing him onely, to drink *a little wine, inſtead of water, for the ſake of his ſtomach and frequent infirmities.* 1 Tim. v. 23.

Timothy

RE-

REFLECTIONS

ON THE

Variations, or Inconſiſtencies,

Which are found among the

FOUR EVANGELISTS

In their different Accounts of the ſame Facts.

REFLECTIONS, &c.

THE harmony or agreement, which is found in the four Goſpels, with regard to the principal tranſactions there recorded, tho' written by different perſons, at different times, and in different places, is juſtly celebrated by the Chriſtian writers, as a ſtrong proof of the integrity of the Evangeliſts, and of the certainty of the facts, which they deliver; and conſequently, of the truth of Chriſtianity itſelf.

It's Adverſaries on the other hand, ſenſible of the force of this reaſoning, have been endeavouring in all ages to ſhake this foundation, by affirming: that there *is no ſuch harmony among the Goſpels*, as is pretended, but on the contrary, *ſuch inconſiſtencies and contradictions, as are ſufficient to blaſt* their authority [a]. But the little ſucceſs which they have met with in their attempts of this kind, ſhews, what little weight their objections are thought to have, by the ſerious and thinking part of mankind.

The Champions however of the Goſpel, not content with ſimple victory, nor ſatisfied with refuting the cavils of it's enemies, reſolved to carry their triumphs ſtill further, and to cut off even the poſſibility of cavilling for the future, by maintaining, that the Evangeliſts were not onely conſiſtent in their accounts of all the greater events, but could not poſſibly contradict each other, even in the ſmalleſt, being all of them perpetually inſpired by a divine and unerring Spirit.

Champions

maintain that the Evangelists
were perpetually inspired

---

[a] Quidam vel impia vanitate, vel imperita temeritate calumniis appetunt, ut eis veracis narrationis derogent fidem— hoc enim ſolent quaſi palmare vanitatis ſuæ objicere, quod ipſi Evangeliſtæ inter ſeipſos diſſentiant. — Auguſt. de Conſen. Evangeliſt. l. 1, §. x.

This opinion obtained in the early ages of the Church, and is aſſerted by ſeveral of the primitive Fathers [*a*] : in conſequence of which, many books have been written, to demonſtrate the real harmony of the Goſpels, in thoſe very paſſages, in which they have generally been thought to contradict or diſſent from each other.

My preſent purpoſe therefore is, to inquire into the ſtate of this quæſtion : and to collect, as far as I am able, what it is, that a Chriſtian is bound to believe, on the one ſide or the other, from the evidence of plain facts, as they are found in the Evangeliſts themſelves : which I ſhall endeavour to explane, without prejudice or partiality, or any other view, than to diſcover and declare what is true, and by that means to promote the real intereſt and honour of religion.

Genealigies of Mathew and Luke.

The firſt objection then, which we meet with to the veracity of the Evangeliſts, even in the primitive ages, is drawn from the two different *genealogies* of our Saviour's family, as they are ſeverally given by *St. Matthew* and *St. Luke :* which are charged with many inconſiſtencies, not onely, when compared with each other, but when conſidered ſeparately and by themſelves.

Teſſeradecades.

For inſtance ; it is allowed by all the Commentators, both antient and modern, that in the ſecond of thoſe Teſſeradecades, or periods of fourteen generations, into which *Matthew* has diſtributed the whole Genealogy, he has either willfully ſuppreſſed, or negligently omitted three ſucceſſive deſcents from father to ſon, between *Joram* and *Ozias*; viz. *Ochozias*, *Joaſh*, *Ahaziah* [*b*] ; in contradiction to the truth of hiſtory, and to thoſe very books, whence he drew the Genealogy itſelf [*c*]. *Jerom*, *Hilary* and other antient Fathers give this reaſon for the omiſſion ; that becauſe *Joram* had allied himſelf to the Houſe of *Ahab*, by taking thence his wife *Athalia*, a ſecond *Jeſabel*; *Matthew* did not think his wicked iſſue, from ſo wicked a wife, worthy to ſtand in the pedigree of the *Holy Jeſus*, even to the third generation [*a*].

[*a*] Solis eis Scripturarum libris, qui jam Canonici appellantur, didici hunc timorem honoremque deferre, ut nullum eorum auctorem ſcribendo aliquid erraſſe firmiſſime credam — Non te arbitror, ſic legi tuos libros velle, tanquam Prophetarum & Apoſtolorum : de quorum ſcriptis, quod omni errore careant, dubitare nefarium eſt. Id. Epiſt. ad Hieron. in Oper. Hieron. T. 4. par. 2. p. 630. Edit. Benedict.

[*b*] Cernis ergo, quod ſecundum fidem hiſtoriæ tres Reges in medio fuerint, quos hic Evangeliſta prætermiſit. Hier. in Matt. 1. Op. T. 4. p. 6.

[*c*] 4 Reg. iii. 8.

But this ſolution is thought ridiculous by ſome of the beſt Expoſitors : for if thoſe three perſons had been thrown out of the Genealogy, on the account of their wickedneſs, the ſame reaſon would have excluded ſeveral others, as *Achaz*, *Manaſſes*, &c. " Let the reader conſider, ſays *Eraſmus*, how it can be conſiſtent " in the Evangeliſt, to ſcruple the admiſſion of any for their im-" piety, when he had given a place to *Ruth*, *and to the wife of* " *Uriah, and to Rahab*, women famous for their lewdneſs [*b*]." And *Jerom* himſelf, tho' he aſſigns the impiety of the three Kings, as the reaſon of their excluſion, yet obſerves, " as a thing, " to be noted, that no women are numbered in the Genealogy, " but ſuch, as are mentioned in the Scriptures with ſome blot " upon their characters, that he who came for the ſake of Sin-" ners, and was himſelf deſcended from Sinners, might wipe out the ſins of all [*c*]." Wherefore it is the opinion of *Grotius*, which is intimated likewiſe by *Jerom*, that *Matthew*'s ſole view, in omitting thoſe three perſons, was to reduce this diviſion of the Genealogy to the number of fourteen ; with which he has reſolved to fill up each of the three periods into which he divided it [*d*].

Erasmus.

Ruth, Uriahs Wife, and Rahab.

Jerom

Grotius and Jerom, "factum est rotundandi numeri causa.

[*a*] Sed in hoc non mendacii aut negligentiæ vitium : tres ratione ſunt præteriti, &c. Hilar. in Matt. i.

Verum quia Joram generi ſe miſcuerat impiiſſimæ Jezabel, idcirco uſque ad tertiam generationem memoria ejus tollitur, ne in ſanctæ nativitatis ordine poneretur. Hieron. ibid.

[*b*] Illud expendat diligens lector, qui conveniat hic Evangeliſtam offenſum fuiſſe quorundam impietate, cum ante *Ruth* poſuerit, & uxorem *Uriæ* & *Rahab*, ſcelere nobiles fœminas. In Matt. i. 17.

[*c*] Notandum eſt genealogia Salvatoris, nullam ſanctarum aſſumi mulierum, ſed eas, quas Scriptura reprehendit : ut qui propter peccatores venerat, de peccatoribus naſcens, omnium peccata deleret. Hieron. in Matt. i.

[*d*] Quod autem perſonas quaſdam omiſerit Matthæus, factum eſt rotundandi numeri cauſa. Grot. in Matt. i. 17. it. Zeger.

Verum quia Evangeliſtæ propoſitum erat, tres Teſſeradecadas, in diverſo temporum ſtatu ponere, idcirco, &c. Hier. ib.

It is obſerved however, at the ſame time, that in his third *Teſſeradecade*, or diviſion of the Pedigree, the number of *fourteen* cannot be made out; ſince all, who are there enumerated, make up *thirteen* onely, including *Jeſus* himſelf. To ſupply this deficiency, *Theophylact* ſays, "that the Babyloniſh captivity, with "which this third period begins, muſt be numbered in the place "of a perſon." But *Auſtin* tells us, "that *Jechonias*, who ſtands "the laſt in the ſecond diviſion, muſt be counted over again at "the head of the third; being, in that great revolution of the "Jewiſh affairs, like a corner-ſtone, which has two different "aſpects, and belongs to two ſides of the building: from which "he collects a myſtical ſenſe, alluding to the perſon of Chriſt [a]." But *Jerom* more critically and reaſonably ſuppoſes, "that there "ſtood originally in the pedigree *two Jechonias's*; the Father and "the Son: the one in the end of the ſecond diviſion; the other, "in the beginning of the third: and that this identity of name, "in two perſons immediately following each other, gave occaſion "to the omiſſion of one of them, through the inadvertency of "the Tranſcribers, in the firſt ages of the Church; whence the "ſame omiſſion was propagated into all the later Copies [b]."

Theophilact

Austin.

Jerom more critical.

It is obſerved likewiſe of this *Jechonias*, who is here ſaid to have begotten *Salathiel*, that he really died childleſs; without any Succeſſor of his own blood, agreeably to what *Jeremiah* had propheſied concerning him [c]. So that if this *Salathiel*, ſaid to have been begotten of him, be the ſame, as ſome think, whom *Luke* calls the *Son of Neri*; then *Jeſus*'s deſcent from *David* was not, as *Matthew* deduces it, through *Solomon*, but through *Nathan* and his poſterity, as *Luke* derives it [d].

Not through Solomon, as Mathew, but Nathan as Luke derives it.

Various conjectures are made by the learned, concerning the reaſons, which induced *Matthew* to divide the Genealogy into three equal periods of fourteen generations; ſome of them of a deep and myſtical ſenſe; but the moſt probable is, what *Grotius* has aſſigned, "that it was for the ſake of aſſiſting the memory; "with which view, he firſt divided the whole into three periods, "diſtinguiſhed by as many remarkable Epocha's; the firſt in-"cluding the time before the Monarchy; the ſecond, the floriſh-"ing ſtate of it; the third, it's declenſion: and then to each "period he aſſigned an equal number of names, as thoſe do, "who artificially help the memory by the means of images diſ-"poſed in certain places: to effect all which, he made no ſcruple "to leave out of the pedigree ſome perſons of inferior note and "merit [a]."

---

[a] Φασὶ τινὲς, ὅτι ϗ τὴν μετοικεσίαν, ὡς προσώπȣ τάξιν ἔχȣσαν ἔθηκεν. Theophyl. in Matt. i.

Illud quod in angulo eſt bis numeratur, in fine ſcilicet prioris ordinis, & in capite ejus deflexionis, &c. Aug. de Conſen. Evangel. l. 2. §. 10.

[b] Hieron. ibid.

[c] Hiremiah, xxii. 30. Lightfoot, in Matt. i. 12.

[d] Grot. in Luc. iii. 27. Lightfoot, ibid.

Grotius. Hurra! Grotius
You are as dextrous as Chris-
ostom or Jerom.!

Dr. Lightfoot tells us, "that, in *Matthew*'s diviſion of the "Genealogy, tho' the facts and numbers do not exactly agree "with the truth, yet the Jews cannot find fault with him, be-"cauſe it was a common rule and practice with them, to reduce "both things and numbers, which came near to each other, to "one and the ſame denomination; of which he gives ſeveral ex-"amples [b]." It is not improbable therefore, that *Matthew*, being a Jew, and writing to the Jews, might uſe that looſe and inaccurate method of computing, which was generally practiſed in thoſe days by the learned of that nation.

Lightfoot, will do as well.
But what becomes of Matthews
Inspiration?

As to the Genealogy given by *Luke*, there is a wonderful confuſion in it, as *Eraſmus* ſays, with regard to the names of perſons; which in ſome copies are too few, in others too many, and in all greatly depraved and inverted. And as in *Matthew*'s Genealogy, ſeveral names are omitted and the true pedigree left incomplete; ſo in *Luke*'s, many are ſuppoſed to have been added by Tranſcribers, to make it agree with certain traditions, entertained about it: of which ſort, as *Grotius* endeavours to ſhew, are the names of *Matthat*, *Levi* and *Cainan* [c]: So that if the names

Luke

Interpolations.

Grotius

[a] Quod ut conſequeretur, parvi duxit perſonas quaſdam minime nobiles tranſilire. Grot. in Matt. i. 17.

[b] Hor. Hebraic. in Matth. i. 17.

[c] In recenſendis nominibus mira confuſio— Eraſ. in Luc. iii. 23.

Erasmus

Ad eum vero numerum res reduci non poteſt niſi & Matthat, & Levi hoc loco omittantur, ut & infra Cainaan. Grot. in Luc. ibid.

Grotius.

omitted by *Matthew* were inſerted, and thoſe, which have been added to *Luke*, were thrown out, it ſeems to be his opinion, as it was alſo of *Eraſmus*, that the numbers in both the Genealogies might be brought to agree very nearly with each other [*a*].

But if from conſidering theſe Genealogies ſeparately, we procede to compare them with each other, we ſhall find them clogged with difficulties, which no Expoſitors, either antient or modern, have been able to ſolve. For tho' both of them deduce the family of *Jeſus* in a direct line from *David*, yet this line is filled up by a ſucceſſion of different perſons in each; ſo that through the whole deſcent we find but two names the ſame in the two pedigrees; and tho' in *Matthew*'s deduction of it, the period from *David* to *Jeſus* contains but *twenty eight* generations, in *Luke*'s, it contains *forty one*.

No Expositors have been able to Solve the difficulties.

28
41.

I have already intimated, how ſome have accounted for the different number of names in each pedigree: but that ſolution will not anſwer the purpoſe, or bring them near to a parity, becauſe all, which appear to have been omitted by *Matthew*, are but *four*, and all which are ſuppoſed to have been added to *Luke*, but three. As to the difference of the perſons themſelves, ſome Commentators labor to ſhew, that the ſame perſons are really enumerated by both the Evangeliſts, tho' under different names; it being the cuſtom of the Jews, for each man to have ſeveral: but ſince all the names are exactly the ſame in them both, from *Abraham to David*, yet differ almoſt totally from *David to Jeſus*, this account of the matter, as *Grotius* rightly obſerves, cannot be thought reaſonable by men of Judgement; nor ſo wide a difference aſcribed to the accidental effect of ſuch a cuſtom [*b*].

Grotius

Another expedient therefore has been invented and eſpouſed by ſome Critics of great name [*c*]: *viz.* that *Matthew* gives us the pedigree of *Joſeph*, the reputed Father, and *Luke*, of *Mary* the

Another Expedient
Mathew gives Josephs Pedigree, Luke Mary's,

[*a*] Quos ſi ceteris adjeceris comperies & numerum conſentire. Eraſm. Ibid.

[*b*] Ex ſola τῆς ϖολυωνομίας cauſa accidiſſe, non facile concedet, qui judicio valet. Grot. in Luc. iii. 23.

[*c*] Eraſmus, Druſius, Toinard, Spanheim, Voſſius, Janſenius, Chemnitius, Lightfoot, &c.

Mother of *Jeſus:* and tho' *Joſeph* be called by *Luke* the Son of *Heli*, he muſt be underſtood to mean the Son in law, as being the huſband of his daughter *Mary*. But this opinion, tho' approved by many of the learned, is juſtly rejected by others, as being wholly grounded on an Hypotheſis, without any ſolid reaſon to ſupport it [*a*]: For *Luke*, without any mention of *Mary*, procedes directly and expreſsly to ſet forth the genealogy of *Joſeph:* " nor was it ever cuſtomary or known among the Jews, to " deduce the deſcent of families through the female line [*b*]."

Families not deduced through the Female Line.

It is objected likewiſe, that tho' both the Evangeliſts profeſs to ſet forth the true family and pedigree of *Jeſus*, yet neither of them have really exhibited it, but have given us onely the deſcent of *Joſeph*, his reputed Father, of whoſe blood he had no ſhare or participation. To this it is anſwered; " that the fa" mily of *Mary* the real mother of *Jeſus*, is included and repre" ſented in that of her huſband; becauſe every man was obliged " by the law of *Moſes*, to take his wife out of his own tribe [*c*]." But this likewiſe does not ſatisfy; becauſe the rule of marrying within the ſame tribe was not conſtantly obſerved; or if it had been ſo, would not prove *Mary* to have been of the ſame family; which is a quite different caſe [*d*]. The Commentators therefore have been driven to another ſhift; to ſuppoſe *Mary* to have been an Heireſs, and for that reaſon obliged to marry her neareſt of kin [*e*]. But this is ſuppoſed again without any foundation: for it does not appear, that there was any other obligation, even upon Heireſſes, than to marry onely within their own tribe: nor is it

Another Shift.

[*a*] Quod quidam exiſtimant, a Matthæo recenſeri genus Joſephi, a Luca autem Mariæ, nequaquam mihi probabile videtur. Grot. in Matth. i. 16.

Grotius

[*b*] —ȣ̓κ ἦν νόμος ϖαρὰ Ἰȣδαίοις γενεαλογεῖσθαι γυναῖκας. Theophyl. in Matth. i. it. Chryſoſt. Hom. 2.

Theophyl.
Chrisost.

Non eſſe conſuetudinis Scripturarum, ut mulierum in generationibus ordo texatur. Hier. in Matt. i.

Hier.

[*c*] Nam ita fit, ut in perſona Joſephi, etiam Mariæ genus comprehendatur, &c. Caſaub. in Luc. iii. 23.

Casaub.

[*d*] Quod aiunt tribules tribulibus nubere debuiſſe, neque perpetuum eſt; neque ſi ſit, eo uſque valere poteſt, ut etiam ex Davidis familia Mariam fuiſſe, inde appareat. Grot. Matt. i. 16.

Grotius

[*e*] Numb. xxxvi. 6.

at

.Mary not an Heireſs.

at all probable, that *Mary* was an Heireſs, ſince all the facts, which are delivered of Her plainly tend to prove the contrary.

Jesus, legally the Son of Joseph.

It ſeems very evident, that the Evangeliſts had no other notion of our Lord's deſcent from *David*, than through *Joſeph*, whoſe ſon he legally was: for whenever they mention *Joſeph*, they generally ſtile him the *Son of David*, or of *the houſe of David*; yet never aſcribe the ſame character to *Mary*: who, from the ſilence of the ſacred writers, as well as from her relation to *Elizabeth*, of the family of *Aaron* [a], is thought moſt probably to have been of a different tribe, from that of her huſband.

Eusebius, says Epiphanius pretended to have rec^d it from Our Saviours own Family.

Grotius.

The opinion then, which ſeems to be the moſt generally received at this day, is; that both the Evangeliſts exhibit the pedigree of *Joſeph* onely, but that *Matthew* gives the ſucceſſion of his natural, *Luke* of his legal parentage. To illuſtrate this, they ſuppoſe, that *Heli* and *Jacob*, each of whom, in the ſeveral Genealogies, is called *the Father of Joſeph*, were brothers; not by the ſame Father, but by the Mother onely; and *Heli*, the elder, being married and dying without iſſue, *Jacob* took his wife, according to the law, to raiſe up ſeed to his brother, and ſo begat *Joſeph*; by nature and blood *the Son of Jacob*; by the law and right of ſucceſſion, the ſon alſo of *Heli*; who deſcended in a direct line from *Nathan*, the Son of *David*, as *Jacob* did from *Solomon*. This account is taken from *Euſebius*, who tells us; that *Epiphanius* pretended to have received it from our Saviour's own family [b]. But *Epiphanius*'s authority is much ſuſpected; and the account itſelf charged with great difficulties, and even abſurdities by the Critics [c]: and *Grotius* particularly, tho' he allows the diſtinction of the legal and natural deſcent of *Joſeph* to be the moſt plauſible ſolution of the diſagreement of the two Genealogies, yet, contrary to all the other interpreters, he aſſigns the deduction of the legal ſtemm to *Matthew*; and of the natural, to *Luke:* which tho' he confirms by many probable, and, as he himſelf thinks, unanſwerable arguments, yet his opinion has had no better fate, than the reſt above mentioned, of being refuted and rejected in it's turn, by all the other Commentators [*a*].

---

[a] Matth. i. 20. Luc. i. 27: ii. 4. it. i. 5, 36.

[b] Euſeb. Hiſt. Ecc. l. 1. c. 7.

[c] Sed eum Scriptorem in multis rebus non tam diligentia, quam judicio & linguarum cognitione deſtitutum, labi, probatu proclive eſt. Grot. in Luc. iii. 23.

Upon the whole, ſince men of the greateſt learning and experience in theſe ſtudies, have not been able to produce any thing ſatisfactory on the ſubject of theſe Genealogies, but have conſtantly exploded each other's notions, ſo that what one had eſtabliſhed as a foundation, was preſently overthrown by another, there ſeems to be no other part left to us, than, with many of the ſame Critics, to conſider the two pedigrees, as inexplicable and irreconcileable, and according to the advice of *St. Paul*, to give no heed to endleſs genealogies, which *miniſter quæſtions, rather than godly edifying, which is in faith* [*b*].

The Pedigrees irreconcileable

St. Paul.

As to the hiſtorical facts, which are recorded in the Goſpels, Interpreters have obſerved likewiſe a ſtrange diſagreement and variation in many of them, as they are ſeverally deſcribed by different Evangeliſts. For example; the ſtory of the woman who anointed our Lord, is thus told by *Matthew* and *Mark, that Jeſus being at Bethany, in the houſe of Simon the Leper, there came in a woman having an Alabaſter box of rich ointment and poured it on his head, as he ſat at meat. St. John*, without any mention of *Simon the Leper*, ſays, *that this paſſed at a Supper made for Jeſus, in Bethany, where Lazarus, whom he had raiſed from the dead, ſat at the table with him, whoſe Siſter Martha waited on them, while his other Siſter Mary*

The Anointment.

in Bethany.

[*a*] Ego vero non conjecturis, ſed liquidis, ni fallor, rationibus adductus certiſſimum arbitror, a Matthæo ſpectari juris ſucceſſionem. Ibid.

[*b*] Cum hactenus tam multi & docti & exercitati viri ita digladiati ſint, ut quæ alius tanquam ſolidiſſima fundamenta poſuerat, alius novis rationibus illa deſtruat, &c. Vid. Clarium. in Matt. i. 1.

Illud interim cavebimus, ne poſt alios etiam ex veteribus, qui naufragium non ſemel hic fecerunt, Genealogiam anxie excutiamus: contenti illo Ambroſii in Lucam, non licet mihi ſcire generationis ſeriem, non licet tamen neſcire generationis fidem. Heinſ. Exercit. Sacr. in Matt. i.

Operam & oleum perdit, qui hic curioſe & ſuperſtioſe diligens, &c. Scultet. Exercit. Evangel. l. 1. 42. See Hammond. on Matt. i.

took a pound of ointment of Spikenard very coſtly, and anointed with it, not the head, *but the feet of Jeſus, and wiped them with her hair. Matthew* ſays, *that when his Diſciples ſaw it, they had indignation, ſaying; to what purpoſe is this waſt? for this ointment might have been ſold for much and given to the poor— Mark* alſo tells us, *that there were ſome, who had indignation at this waſt, and were very angry with the woman for it.* But *John* ſays, that *it was onely Judas Iſcariot,* who grumbled at it— *not that he cared for the poor, but becauſe he was a thief, and had the bag and bare what was put therein* [a].

The Unction

Jerom

Theophylact

Austin

Possibility of a Mistake

This ſtory of the unction of *Jeſus,* by a certain woman, who had been a Sinner, as it is related by *Luke* [b], ſupplies ſo many freſh difficulties, that the Expoſitors both antient and modern have been driven to their uſual ſhift, of ſuppoſing theſe different accounts to relate to different facts performed at different times, and by different women. *Let no man imagine,* ſays *Jerom, that it was the ſame woman, who anointed the head, and the feet of Jeſus.* Where the Editor of his works admoniſhes us by a marginal note, that there were *many Mary's, who anointed him* [c]. *Theophylact* ſuppoſes, that there were *three*; but *Auſtin,* that the ſame thing was performed *twice by the ſame woman* [d]. Yet all theſe varying accounts agree ſo remarkably with each other in every principal circumſtance, that it is abſurd and irrational, to feign ſeveral diſtinct ſtories, to ſerve the prejudices onely of thoſe, who think it impious, to allow the poſſibility of an error or miſtake in the Evangeliſts. For *Luke* affirms with *John,* that this paſſed at an entertainment made for *Jeſus*; and with the other Two, in the houſe of a perſon called *Simon*; and in the words of *Mark*, that the woman brought *an Alabaſter box of ointment*; and again, with *John*, that ſhe anointed, not the head, *but the feet of Jeſus* [a]. But what ſeems to put the caſe beyond all doubt, is; that *John*, ſpeaking in another place of this *Mary*, the ſiſter of *Lazarus*, before his mention of this fact, ſays of her, by an anticipation or *prolepſis*, not unuſual with the ſacred writers, *She who anointed the Lord, with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair:* which deſignation of her perſon, by ſo particular a circumſtance would have been impertinent and equivocal, as *Grotius* obſerves, if there had been more facts of the ſame kind, and *more Mary's*, who anointed him [b].

---

[a] Matt. xxvi. 6. Mar. xiv. 3. Joh. xii. 1.

Scio quoſdam hunc locum calumniari, quare alius Evangeliſta Judam ſolum dixerit contriſtatum, & Matthæus ſcribat omnes Apoſtolos contriſtatos; neſcientes tropum, qui dicitur σύλληψις, vel Synecdoche— Hier. in Matt. xxvi. Op, T. 4. p. 125.

[b] Luk. vii. 37.

[c] Nemo putet eandem eſſe quæ unguentum fudit ſuper caput & quæ ſuper pedes, &c. Id. ibid.

[d] Τινὲς τρεῖς λέγȣσιν εἶναι, &c. Theophyl. in Matt. xxvi.

Nihil itaque aliud intelligendum, niſi non quidem aliam fuiſſe mulierem— ſed eandem Mariam bis hoc feciſſe— Auguſt. de Conſ. Evang. l. 2. §. 154.

Grotius.

There is a great difference alſo in the time, which is aſſigned to this unction by the Evangeliſts, whence the chief argument is drawn for the diverſity of the fact: for three of them declare it to have happened a few days before the death of *Jeſus*; whereas *Luke* deſcribes it, as done in the beginning of his miniſtry, and while *John Baptiſt* was living. But this will eaſily be accounted for, by alledging what the moſt ſcrupulous of the Commentators allow, that the *Evangeliſts* took no care, nor thought, to diſpoſe their facts in the proper order of time, in which they were tranſacted, but ſet them down, juſt as their memory ſupplied them; and what they had forgotten in it's proper place, related in another, as they happened to recollect it; and that *Luke* in particular was leſs accurate in this article than any of them, as he compiled his hiſtory, not from his own knowledge or experience, but from materials received at ſecond hand from others. Wherefore ſince in the caſe of this ſame ſtory, as it is ſeparately related by three of the *Evangeliſts*, we confeſſedly ſee ſeveral variations or ſeem-

Difference in the time.

Luke compiled his, from materials at 2d hand.

---

[a] Non tantum unam eandemque fuiſſe mulierem, ſed & factum idem, cur negetur non video: neque enim temere multiplicandæ hiſtoriæ.—Hæ circumſtantiæ ſunt ἀκριβέστεραι quam ut diverſis temporibus congruant. Grot. in Matt. xxvi. 6.

[b] Non poterat autem certa ſatis nota ſumi ex eo, quod ſæpiùs acciderat, &c. Grot. ibid.

ing inconſiſtencies; what ſcruple or danger can there be, in admitting a few more, from the relation of a fourth, who, in his account of facts, which are common to them all, is obſerved, for the reaſon juſt mentioned, to be more confuſed and inaccurate than any of them [*a*].

Treachery of Judas.

After the ſtory juſt mentioned, there follows another in the ſame chapter, of our Lord's foretelling to his Diſciples the treachery of *Judas*, which is related alſo variouſly by the Evangeliſts. For his Apoſtles, as they ſat at table with him, being grieved to hear him declare, that one of their number ſhould prove ſo vile a traitor, were very deſirous, for their own juſtification, that the perſon might be named, and *began every one to ſay, Lord is it I?* Whereupon *Jeſus* gave them a ſign or token, by which they might diſtinguiſh him, ſaying; *He, who dippeth his hand with me in the diſh, the ſame ſhall betray me.* This account is given by *Matthew* and *Mark*; but *John* gives a very different turn to it: *that Peter beckened to John, who was leaning on Jeſus's boſom, to aſk, who it ſhould be: and John having put the quæſtion, Jeſus anſwered; He it is, to whom I ſhall give a ſop, when I have dipped it: and when he had dipped the ſop, he gave it to Judas* [*b*].

Shifts.

The difference is of no conſequence, and might ſafely be imputed to want of accuracy or memory, in recollecting and recording minute circumſtances: but ſuch an imputation is generally thought ſo diſhonorable to the Evangeliſts, that it is pleaſant to ſee, what ſhifts have been contrived to evade it. We are told then, that this deſignation of the traitor *Judas, by the delivery of a ſop to him,* was not ſignified by *Jeſus* in common to all his Apoſtles, but to *John* onely in private, then lying upon his boſom; who had *whiſpered the quæſtion* to his Maſter, and was anſwered alſo *by a whiſper*, which was not explaned to the reſt; who knew therefore nothing more of the matter, than what is recorded by *Matthew* and *Mark* [a]. So blind is prejudice, that to refute the ſuſpicion of an error or ſlip of memory in the Evangeliſts, it does not ſcruple to charge them with ignorance of the facts, which they had undertaken to tranſmit to poſterity.

[*a*] Nihil certius, quam a Scriptoribus Evangeliorum multa referri, non temporis ordine ſed rerum ductu. Grot. in Matt. xxvi. 6.

Matthæus non ordine quo geſtum eſt, ſed quo prætermiſſum recolit, &c. Auguſt. de Conſ. Evang. l. 2. §. 53.

Marcus ea juxta fidem magis geſtorum narravit, quam ordinem. Hieron. Prol. in Matt.

None of them agree throughout in obſerving the order and ſucceſſion of the actions related, &c. Hammond Prol. in Matt. p. 4.

Luke who wrote his ſtory from collections he had from others, hath not ſo exactly obſerved the order, and hath varied from the others in words and circumſtances, &c. ibid.

[*b*] Matt. xxvi. 23. Mar. xiv. 20. Joh. xiii. 26.

Two Dæmoniacs.

Matthew relates, that *two Dæmoniacs*, who lived furious among the tombs, in the country of *the Gadarenes*, were cured by *Jeſus*, when he permitted the ejected Devils to enter *into the herd of ſwine*: but *Mark* and *Luke* tell the ſame ſtory of *one man* onely, poſſeſſed *by a legion of Devils* [b]. *Auſtin*, accounting for this difference, ſays; "that we are to underſtand, that one of the "two Dæmoniacs mentioned by *Matthew* was of a more diſtinguiſhed and eminent character; for whoſe unhappy caſe that "country was chiefly concerned, and more particularly ſollicitous "for his ſafety: ſo that the other two Evangeliſts, being deſirous to ſignify this, thought it beſt to mention him alone, by "whoſe means the fame of this miracle had been more widely "and effectually ſpread [c].

Austin.

Two blind Men.

Matthew informs us alſo, that *two blind men* implored the help of *Jeſus*, as he was paſſing along the road, and were cured by him of their blindneſs: but *Mark* tells the ſame fact of *one man* onely ſo cured, whoſe name he particularly mentions, *Bartimeus the ſon of Timæus*: they both however declare the caſe to have

Bartimeus Son of Timæus.

---

[a] Nulli diſcipulorum aperte demonſtravit, quis illum traditurus eſſet, præterquam Johanni, cui ſecrete percunctanti ſecrete reſponſum puto. — Zeger. in Matt. xxvi. 23.

Cum Johannes ſubmiſſiori voce interrogaret, Chriſtus ſubmiſſa itidem voce indicavit—quod cum non intellexiſſent reliqui Apoſtoli, &c. Lud. Cappell. in Joh. xiii. 26.

[b] Matt. viii. 28. Mar. v. 2. Luc. viii. 26.

[c] Intelligas unum eorum fuiſſe perſonæ alicujus clarioris & famoſioris, quem regio illa maxime dolebat, & pro ejus ſalute plurimum ſatagebat, &c. de Conſ. Evang. l. 2. §. 56.

Origen

happened, as *Jeſus* returned from *Jericho:* but *Luke*, who agrees with *Mark*, in mentioning but *one blind man*, contradicts them both, in affirming the miracle to have been wrought, as *Jeſus was going towards Jericho* [a]. *Origen* remarks on this paſſage; "that if we believe the Evangeliſts to have written their Goſpels under the direction of the Holy Ghoſt, we muſt believe at the ſame time, that three diſtinct ſtories are here recorded; ſince circumſtances ſo contradictory cannot be true of one and the ſame. Yet thoſe, ſays he, who ſearch deeper into the ſenſe of Scripture, will find, that it is but one and the ſame tranſaction, delivered in different words by them all [b]."

Austin

St. *Auſtin* thinks it a ſufficient ſolution of the difficulty, to ſuppoſe the ſame miracle to have been twice performed, on *two ſeveral blind men*; on the one, as *Jeſus went*, and on the other, *as he returned* from *Jericho* [c]. And he gives the ſame reaſon again, as in the former caſe, why *Mark* has choſen to ſpeak onely of one of them; "becauſe his ſtory was more known and famous in that City: as it is evident, he ſays, from the mention of the name of the man and of his Father alſo: whom he ſuppoſes to have been reduced from ſome floriſhing ſtate of life, to this miſerable condition of blindneſs and beggary: whoſe cure therefore made the miracle as notorious as his calamity [d]." But it is ſurely more reaſonable to ſay here, what I find to have been ſaid, by a ſtrenuous advocate of the Goſpel, that theſe ſeveral accounts of the Evangeliſts *are different indeed, but not contradictory: and that* Matthew *was more accurate in this inſtance, than either* Mark *or* Luke [e]; as in the next, we ſhall find *Luke*, in his turn, more exact than the other two.

---

[a] Matt. xx. 30. Mar. x. 46. Luc. xviii. 35.

[b] Orig. Comm. in Matt. Edit. Huet. T. 1. p. 427.

[c] Nihil aliud reſtat intelligere, niſi bis eſſe factum hoc miraculum, &c. Auguſt. Quæſtion. Evang. l. 2. Quæſt. XLVIII. 1.

[d] De Conſ. Evang. l. 2. §. 125.

[e] At hæc non contraria, ſed tantum diverſa — & a Matthæo, accuratius quam a Luca, hiſtoria deſcribitur.— Cuper. arcana Atheiſm, revelat. l. 2. p. 169.

The two thieves.

The ſtory of *the two Thieves*, who were crucified together with *Jeſus*, is related alſo in the ſeveral Goſpels with a very remarkable difference. *Matthew* and *Mark* tell us onely in ſhort, that *both the Thieves*, as they were hanging with him on the Croſs, *inſulted and reviled Jeſus:* whereas *Luke* more particularly declares, that it was but *one of them*, who reviled him, while the other acted a contrary part, and, having rebuked his fellow-ſufferer for his inſolence, ſaid unto *Jeſus*, *Lord remember me, when thou comeſt into thy Kingdom* [a].

Hugo

Chryſoſtom, Jerom.

The Critics again, both antient and modern, take great pains to elude the charge of a contradiction: but none have been ſo hardy, as *Cardinal Hugo*, who, as he is cited by *Eraſmus*, treats this paſſage in *Matthew*, as little better than *a lie*; *or ſuch an account, as one would expect from a man in his cups* [b]. St. *Chryſoſtom* and *Jerom*, and all the Antients, allow a ſeeming contradiction in the words, but attempt to clear the Evangeliſts of it, by ſuppoſing, “that both the Thieves blaſphemed *Jeſus* at firſt, till one of them, convinced by the prodigies, which then happened, of the Sun darkened and the earth trembling, quickly changed his note, and, from a ſudden converſion and repentance, implored his mercy [c].” Which ſolution, tho' embraced, according to cuſtom, by many of the moderns, is juſtly rejected by others, as a groundleſs and fictitious comment [d]. For what contradiction, how groſs ſoever, might not eaſily be ſolved and eluded, if ſuch a method of interpreting were allowed, which, without any authority from hiſtory, indulged a liberty of inventing and ſupplying every imaginable circumſtance, which the fact could poſſibly admit.

---

[a] Matt. xxvii. 44. Mar. xv. 32. Luc. xxiii. 39.

[b] Hoc, inquit, videtur falſum — ac mox, Hoc, inquit, dicitur, ut putes dictum inter pocula. Eraſm. in Matt. xxvii. 44.

[c] Non quod diſcrepent Evangelia, ſed quod primum uterque blaſphemaverit, dehinc ſole fugiente, terra commota, — unus crediderit in Jeſum, & priorem negationem ſequenti confeſſione emendaverit. — Hier. Comm. in Matt. xxvii. it. Chryſoſt. Hom. in Paralyt. T. 3. p. 30. Edit. Bened. it. Theophyl. in Matt. xxvii. it. Zeger, in Matt. ibid. & Hammond, ibid.

[d] Hæc congeſſi, nequis cum antiquis aliquot ad eam interpretationem confugiat, quæ parum probabiliter ſtatuit, Latronem, qui in Chriſto credidit, ſubito a convitiis ad eam pietatem converſum: quo commento ſublato, &c. Grot. in Matt. xxvii. 44.

The ſolution therefore, which is now generally received, is this; that the Evangeliſts have uſed onely *the plural*, inſtead of *the ſingular* number, and by a common uſe of language, have ſpoken indefinitely or generally, on a ſingle or particular caſe; which they illuſtrate by other examples from the ſacred Writers. Yet this, if allowed even to be true, cannot be applicable to the caſe before us: for when *Matthew* ſays, that *the Thieves*, and *Mark*, *that they alſo, who were crucified with him reviled him*: if nothing more had been ſaid by *Luke*, than that this was done onely by one of them; the difference might poſſibly have been reconciled: but when *Luke* expreſsly tells us, that of *the two Thieves* crucified, the one railed on *Jeſus*, and the other on the contrary, by a ſurprizing converſion, confeſſed his faith in him, and implored his mercy, the difference is too preciſe and glaring to be ſmoothed over by the uſe of a trope or figure, which ſome call an *Enallage*, others a *Syllepſis* [a].

Enallage, Syllepsis

What other method then is there left of accounting for this contrariety, but that, which the caſe itſelf naturally offers to us; that *Luke* had his account probably from ſome, who had obſerved more exactly every circumſtance of the Crucifixion, or, by ſtanding nearer to the Croſs, had heard more diſtinctly all, which was ſaid by thoſe, who were crucified? For it is highly improbable, or impoſſible rather, to imagine, that the other *Evangeliſts* would have omitted to mention a fact of ſuch moment, and one of the moſt remarkable in the New Teſtament, if it had come to their knowledge: a fact, I ſay, ſo full both of inſtruction and of comfort to all Chriſtians, both good and bad; which decides the grand quæſtion about the immediate ſtate of departed ſouls, and the entrance of the juſt into Paradiſe: ſince it is abſurd to imagine, that this Thief, after a life wholly ſpent in riot

Decides the question of an intermediate Annihilation.

---

[a] Sed etiam quia unus hoc fecit, potuit uſitato locutionis modo per pluralem numerum ſignificari. — Auguſt. de Conſ. Evang. l. 3. §. 53. See Grot. Eraſm. and the other Critics on this text.

and wickedneſs, ſhould by a ſudden repentance, how ſignal or ſincere ſoever, obtain any peculiar reward, beyond what is prepared for the faithful and the righteous [a]. St. *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaking of this very caſe in one of his Sermons, ſays; "Chriſt introduced the Thief into Paradiſe, loaded with an infinite "weight of ſins. But was this then the ſole wonder in the caſe, "that he introduced a Thief into Paradiſe? No, there is another "ſtill greater. For he introduced him preferably to all the "world, and to his own Apoſtles; that no man hereafter might "deſpair of an admiſſion, or loſe all hopes of his own Salvation, "tho' he be ſpending his life in the Courts of Kings, and charged "with all the vices, which there abound [b]."

Chrisostom.

Courtiers need not despair.

We find likewiſe an irreconcileable difference, or contradiction, between *Mark* and *John*, concerning the time of the day, when *Jeſus* was crucified. *Mark* ſays expreſsly, that it was but *the third hour*, or *nine of the clock in the morning*, when they had actually fixed him on the Croſs: *John* ſays, that it was about *the ſixth hour, or twelve of the clock*, while he was yet under examination before *Pilate* [c].

Hour of the Crucifixion.

---

[a] Mihi quidem tale hoc miraculum videtur, ut illuſtrius majuſque nullum alibi exſtare exiſtimem: nullum quod afflictos peccatorum mole animos magis attollat.—Heinſ. Exercit. Sacr. in Luc. xxiii.

[b] Oper. T. 4. p. 679. C. Edit. Benedict.

Austin

N. B. St. Auſtin, having affirmed in a certain treatiſe, that Baptiſm was abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, and being urged with the caſe of this Thief, as a confutation of his opinion, makes anſwer; "that "the Thief was reckoned by that holy "Biſhop *St. Cyprian*, in the number of "thoſe Martyrs, who were baptized by "their own blood: which was the caſe "of many, in the times of perſecution, "who had not the opportunity of a regular baptiſm. That it was believed "alſo and not improbably, that, as he "hung ſo near on the Croſs, he might "be ſprinkled with ſome of that water, "which iſſued together with blood, from "the wound in *Jeſus*'s ſide, and ſo was "waſhed by that moſt holy baptiſm: and "farther, that no body could certainly "know, whether he had not been regularly baptized either in his priſon or before he was taken." [De origin. Anim. l. 1. c. 9. l. 3. c. 9.] Which ſhews, how one groundleſs hypotheſis, obſtinately maintained, neceſſarily creates many more of the ſame kind, and intangles us of courſe in a perpetual labyrinth of error and abſurdity.

[c] Mar. xv. 25. John xix. 14.

Peter of Alexandria.

Peter, *Biſhop of Alexandria*, who lived in the third century, declares, *that in both thoſe Goſpels the third hour was written, as it might be ſeen in the very original exemplar of St.* John's *Goſpel, which was preſerved to his time in the Church of* Epheſus. But this is looked upon by the generality of the Critics, as an undoubted forgery, either of *Biſhop Peter*, or ſome Tranſcriber of his works, contrived for the ſake of reconciling the two Evangeliſts [*a*].

thought a Forgery.

Jerom

St. *Jerom*, who lived about a century later, tells us juſt the contrary. "That *the ſixth hour* was written originally in both "the Goſpels; but that the Tranſcribers inſtead of writing the "word at length, put for it the mark, ϛ, which commonly ſig"nified the number ſix; but was miſtaken by other Tranſcrib"ers for the letter, Γ, the numeral mark for *three*; whence the "ſame miſtake was propagated into all the later Copies [*b*]." But this ſolution is clogged likewiſe with inſuperable difficulties, and rejected therefore by the Critics; who find, that ſuch abbreviations, or numeral marks were not commonly uſed in thoſe early ages [*c*]; ſince none of them are to be met with in the oldeſt of thoſe manuſcripts which ſtill remain: nor is it poſſible, that the accidental miſtake of one or two Tranſcribers could be transferred univerſally into all the later Copies.

Austin

St. *Auſtin* gives us a third ſolution, much more ſubtil and refined, "that *Mark*, who ſays, they crucified him at *the third* "*hour*, is not to be underſtood to denote the time of his being

---

[*a*] Vid. Millii Not. in loc. it. Grot. But of what authority that relation is, may yet be quæſtioned: and the antient *Alexandrian* Copy accords in the main with the printed Copies.—And it is more probable, that the reading, τρίτη, the *third hour* in *Mark*, ſhould move ſome tranſcribers to read τρίτη too in *John*, to take away the ſeeming difference, and to accord the Evangeliſts, than for any one to turn τρίτη into ἕκτη, contrary to what was before in *Mark*, if they had found it otherwiſe. Hammond on Joh. xix. 14.

[*b*] Hoc videtur eſſe diverſum ſed non eſt diverſum: error Scriptorum fuit: & in Marco *hora ſexta* ſcriptam fuit: ſed multi epiſemum græcum ϛ putaverunt eſſe Γ, &c. Hieron. in Pſalm. lxxvii. it. Theophylact. in Joh. xix. 14.

[*c*] Neque vero per notas ſcriptos fuiſſe numeros in primogenis Codicibus, ullo argumento conſtat. Grot. in Mar. xv. 25. Zeger. ib. it. Millii Not.

" nailed to the Croſs, but of that clamor, which was made a-" gainſt him by the Jews, while he was ſtill before Pilate, when " they cried out, *crucify him, crucify him*, deſigning to inſinuate " thereby, that the Jews, who made that outcry for his Cruci-" fixion, were more properly the authors of it, than thoſe mi-" niſters, who afterwards executed the command of their ſupe-" riors: and that he was more truly crucified at *the third hour*, " by the tongues of the Jews, than *at the ſixth*, by the hands of " the Soldiers. If you do not like my explication, ſays he, ſhew " me, how it is poſſible to ſolve the contradiction: ſhew, how " Jeſus could be crucified both *at the third* and *the ſixth* " *hour* [a]."

The modern Expoſitors therefore rejecting all the ſolutions juſt mentioned, have hit upon another, ſomewhat more plauſible, in which they generally follow each other; *viz.* " that the day " among the Jews, beginning from ſix in the morning, was di-" vided into four equal portions of three hours each; called *the* " *third, the ſixth, the ninth, and the twelfth hours:* the three " firſt of which were the ſtated hours of public prayer in the " Temple, and proclamed to the people by the ſound of a trum-" pet. As *the third hour* then was ſuppoſed to continue till the " next ſounding of the Trumpet, at *the ſixth hour*, ſo whatever " was tranſacted within that interval, how near ſoever to the be-" ginning of the next diviſion, was ſaid, in the common way of " ſpeech, to happen *in the third hour* [b]." But tho' this would bring the Evangeliſts nearer to each other, yet it will not reconcile them; ſince *Mark* expreſsly affirms, that *Jeſus* was actually crucified before that hour, in which *John* ſays as expreſsly, that *Pilate* was ſtill ſitting in judgement upon him. Nor is the notion itſelf true, that ſuch a groſs diviſion of the day was in uſe among the Jews, as may be ſhewn from many paſſages of the

---

[a] Occulte oſtendere voluit, eos magis crucifixiſſe Jeſum, qui clamaverunt, ut crucifigeretur, quam illos, qui miniſterium Principi præſtiterunt, &c. — Auguſt. de Conſ. Evan. l. 3. §. 42.

[b] Vid. Grot. in Matt. xxvii. 45. Zeger. in Mar. xv. 25. Hammond on Joh. xix. 14.

New Teſtament: for tho' *the third, ſixth and ninth hours*, as being the ſolemn *hours* of religious worſhip, were more remarkable than the reſt, and for that reaſon are more frequently mentioned by the ſacred writers, yet we find, that their day, like to that of the *Babylonians*, from whom they probably learnt the diviſion of it, as the Greeks alſo did, was divided into *twelve hours* [a]. *Are there not twelve hours of the day?* ſays our Lord: and in other places, mention is made of *the ſeventh, tenth, and the eleventh hour*, &c. [b] So that on the whole, we muſt be forced at laſt, with ſeveral of the Critics, to leave the difficulty, juſt as we found it, chargeable with all the conſequences of a manifeſt inconſiſtency [c].

A manifest Inconsistency.

The occurrences alſo, which paſſed at our Lord's ſepulcher, immediately after his reſurrection, are deſcribed ſo variouſly by different Evangeliſts, that the learned have been ſtrangely puzzled to reconcile them, and ſome obliged to give them up as contradictory [d]. *Jerom*, in his anſwer to a quæſtion, which was put to him, how *Mark's account could be reconciled with Matthew's*, ſays; " that *Mark*'s teſtimony might be rejected here as ſpurious, " becauſe it was found onely in a few copies of the Goſpels, and " ſcarce in any of the Greek, and eſpecially, as it ſeemed to re- " late things contrary to the other Evangeliſts [e]." The ſame is confirmed alſo by other primitive writers, who tell us, that *the laſt twelve verſes of* Mark'*s Goſpel* were not to be found in many Copies of thoſe early ages. Yet after a moſt diligent ſcru-

Jerom rejects Mark

---

[a] Τὰ δώδεκα μέρεα τῆς ἡμέρης παρὰ Βαβυλωνίων ἔμαθον Ἕλληνες. Herodot. l. 2. p. 129. Ed. Lond.

[b] John xi. 9. iv. 52. i. 40. Matt. xx. 26.

[c] Ego ampliandum cenſeo. Nam & illi & hi non ſatis probarunt mihi dicta ſua. Nihil dicit, qui non probat quod dicit. Ego experientia didici, ſæpe deceptos eſſe qui nimium crediderunt viris doctis, etiam Theologis, aliquid aſſerentibus ſine fide, ſine teſte. Druſius. in Mar. xv. 25.

[d] Alia non pauca hoc loco ſunt, quæ non facile quis ex Evangeliſtarum collatione docere poſſet non eſſe pugnantia. Zeger. in Marc. xvi. 5.

[e] Aut enim non recipimus Marci teſtimonium, quod in raris fertur Evangeliis, omnibus Græciæ libris pene hoc capitulum non habentibus; præſertim cum diverſa atque contraria Evangeliſtis ceteris narrare videatur. Hier. ad Hedib. Quæſt. 3. T. 4. p. 172.

tiny into this fact, it is the general opinion of the Critics, that the ſaid verſes were certainly a genuin part of that Goſpel, but left out by ſcrupulous or weak Tranſcribers, as being thought irreconcileable with the other Goſpels [a].

But to give an inſtance or two of the diſagreement of the Evangeliſts, with regard to what paſſed at the ſepulcher; they all tell us, that the women, who came with Jeſus, out of Galilee, whoſe names and number are variouſly deſcribed, having bought ſweet ſpices to anoint his dead body, ran with great eagerneſs to the ſepulcher in the morning after the Sabbath, very early, at or before the break of day: where, according to *Matthew* and *Mark*, they ſaw but *one Angel*; according to *Luke* and *John*, they ſaw *two*. The Angel in *Matthew was ſitting without the ſepulcher*, on the ſtone, which he had rolled away from the door [b]. The Angel in *Mark* was ſitting within the ſepulcher on the right ſide [c]. The two Angels in *Luke*, appeared to them of a ſudden within the ſepulcher, *and ſtood by them, while they were perplexed and doubting within themſelves, what was become of the body of Jeſus* [d]: but the two Angels in *John* were ſeen by them, when they firſt looked into the ſepulcher, *the one ſitting at the head, the other at the feet, where the body had layen* [e].

Women

one Angel; two

Angel without; within

at the head and feet

To ſolve theſe inconſiſtencies, the Commentators, inſtead of a ſingle apparition of one or more Angels, generally ſuppoſe, that there were ſeveral, at leaſt *three*: and tho' the Evangeliſts ſeem to deſcribe but one viſit of the women to the ſepulcher, they imagine, that there were many; ſometimes *of them all in company together*; ſometimes ſingly, *now of one and then of another*; as if they had done nothing that whole morning, but run backwards and forwards between the city and the tomb [f]. *Theophylact* ſays, " that the Angel, who was firſt

Theophylact

---

[a] Vid. Simon. Hiſt. Crit. du Nouveau Teſt. c. xi. it. Millii Not. in Mar. xvi. 8. Edit. N. T.

[b] Matt. xxviii. 2.

[c] Mar. xvi. 5.

[d] Luc. xxiv. 4.

[e] Joh. xx. 12.

[f] Quod diverſa tempora mulierum deſcribuntur, non mendacii ſignum eſt, ut impii objiciunt, ſed ſedulæ viſitationis officium: dum crebro abeunt & recurrunt. Hier. in Matt. xxviii. Fieri

“ ſeen ſitting on the ſtone at the door, muſt be ſuppoſed to have “ riſen up, as ſoon as the women arrived, and gone before them “ into the ſepulcher, where he appeared to them again on the “ right, in order to make *Matthew* conſiſtent with *Mark:* and “ *Auſtin* tells us, that the two Angels within the ſepulcher, who “ were ſitting, the one at the head, the other at the feet, where “ Jeſus had lain, muſt be ſuppoſed to have ſtood up, as ſoon as “ the women entered, to reconcile *John*'s account with *Luke*'s [*a*].” And what effect can all this have, but to confirm that very charge, which they labor to elude, of confuſion and inaccuracy in the ſacred writers; by ſuppoſing them to have jumbled and blended into one ſtory many different tranſactions, which, in order to be rightly underſtood, ought to have been ſeparated and diſtinguiſhed from each other?

According to *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke*, the women, as ſoon as they had ſeen the Angels, and were informed by them of our Lord's reſurrection, returned in all haſt to carry the news of it to the Apoſtles; upon which *Peter* ran immediately to the ſepulcher. But *John*, who wrote the laſt of them, and after he had ſeen their accounts, tells a quite contrary ſtory; that before any apparition, *Mary*, ſeeing onely the ſtone taken away from the door of the ſepulcher, haſtened back to tell it to *Peter*, and to the other Apoſtle, whom *Jeſus* loved, and that *Peter*, accompanied by that Apoſtle, ran away directly to the place, and ſaw the linnen cloaths lying and the napkin, which was about the head of *Jeſus*, wrapped up in a place by itſelf, and then went back to their own home, without ſeeing any Angel, or *Jeſus* himſelf, as the women are ſaid to have done.

Hammond.

Dr. *Hammond* explaning the reaſon of this difference, ſays; “ that *Luke* writing from notes, which he had collected, and not

---

Fieri enim potuit, ut mulieres iſtæ non ſemel, neque omnes ſimul, ſed ſemel ſimul, poſtea nunc hæc nunc illa, &c. Cuper. Arcana Atheiſm. revelat. 2. p. 172. it. Toinard. Harm. Evan. p. 132, &c.

[*a*] Vid. Theophyl. in Matt. xxviii. Hic intelligendi ſunt ſurrexiſſe Angeli, ut etiam ſtantes viderentur, ſicut eos Lucas commemorat. Auguſt. Conſ. Evan. l. 3. §. 69.

“ from his own knowledge, obſerves not ſo exactly the order of “ time, wherein things were done or ſpoken; but oftentimes in “ another method puts together things of affinity to one another, “ though not done or ſaid at the ſame time [a].”

But this ſolution, tho’ proper on other occaſions, will not ſerve on this: becauſe the want of order ſo obſervable, in the one, or the other of theſe narrations, ſeems chargeable to *John*, rather than to the reſt, whoſe relation of the matter is again confirmed and repeated in the converſation of the *two Diſciples going to Emmaus* [b]. *Grotius*, who uſually imputes theſe difficulties to the general cuſtom of the Evangeliſts, of neglecting the order of time, in which things were tranſacted, yet aſſigns a ſpecial reaſon, why *John*, in this particular caſe, might think fit to uſe a little artifice, and induſtriouſly invert the true order of the facts; “ for leſt the teſtimony of women, in a point of ſuch mo-“ ment, as *the reſurrection of Jeſus*, might be ſuſpected and ri-“ diculed, as it afterwards really was, *John*, he imagines, re-“ ſolved to place *Peter*’s teſtimony and his own before it, tho’ “ out of their proper time: the truth of which, at the time of “ writing his Goſpel, *Peter* had already ſealed with his blood, “ as he himſelf was prepared alſo to do, whenever he ſhould be “ called to it [c].”

Grotius thinks

John might use a little Artifice.

It is very remarkable alſo, that the ſhort Inſcription or Title, which, by *Pilate*’s order, was fixed upon the Croſs, over the head of *Jeſus*, is delivered with ſome variation, by every one of the Evangeliſts.

Matthew ſays; They ſet up over his head his accuſation written;

Mathew

---

[a] Hammond on Joh. xx. 11.

[b] Luc. xxiv. 23, 24.

[c] Apud Johannem eadem quæ hic hiſtoria narratur, nihil enim video cur aliam putemus, cum tot circumſtantiæ, congruant. — Neque Johanni cur naturalem hic ordinem inverteret juſta cauſa defuit. Sciebat quam imbecille futurum eſſet apud multos teſtimonium muliebre — quare Johannes acturus de re, ut veriſſima, ita creditu difficili, ſuum & *Petri* teſtimonium narrationi præſtruxit, &c. in Matt. xxviii. 2.

THIS IS IESVS THE KING OF THE IEWS [a].

Inscriptions different in all.

Mark; The ſuperſcription of his accuſation was written over;

THE KING OF THE IEWS [b].

Luke; A ſuperſcription alſo was written over him, in letters of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew;

THIS IS THE KING OF THE IEWS [c].

John; *Pilate* wrote a Title, and put it on the Croſs, and the writing was;

IESVS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE IEWS [d].

Now all theſe accounts agree very well with regard to the ſenſe of them, yet it is certain, that there is but one of the four, which exhibits the true Inſcription: and tho' a difference ſo trifling cannot reflect any diſgrace on the veracity of *the Evangeliſts*, it ſhews however a want of that accuracy and exactneſs of truth, which we expect from all thoſe, who undertake to tranſmit to poſterity the authentic copies of public Inſcriptions.

I ſhall add one inſtance more of the ſame kind, trifling indeed with regard to the point in difference, yet effectual to evince the ſame ſort of inadvertency or miſtake, with regard to the ſtrictneſs of truth. *Matthew* reciting the teſtimony of *John Baptiſt*, concerning *Jeſus*, gives theſe words as a part of it; *whoſe ſhoes I am not worthy to bear* [e]: but the other Evangeliſts tell us, that the words were; *the latchet of whoſe ſhoes I am not worthy to ſtoop down and unlooſe* [f]. Upon which *St. Auſtin* makes the follow-

ſhoes

---

[a] Matt. xxvii. 37.
[b] Mark xv. 26.
[c] Luke xxiii. 38.
[d] Joh. xix. 19.
[e] Matt. iii. 11.
[f] Mar. i. 7. Lu. iii. 16. Joh. i. 17.

ing remark: "that *to carry ſhoes, and to untie the latchet of a ſhoe,* Austin.
"ſeem indeed to be different, not in words onely, or the order "of them, or in the manner of ſpeaking, but in the very thing "or fact itſelf— ſo that he, who has recorded the words, which "were really ſpoken by the Baptiſt, has told us the truth, while "he, who has reported them differently, tho' he may not be "guilty of a lie, will be thought to have put one thing for another through want of memory. But no ſort of falſehood, "whether it procede from a lie, or forgetfulneſs, ought to be "imputed to the Evangeliſts: wherefore, if the *Baptiſt,* when "he ſpoke of our Lord's ſhoes, had no other meaning, but to "ſignify the excellence of *Jeſus* and his own humility, it was "the ſame thing, whether he ſpoke of *carrying or untying,* "*ſhoes*; and whoever mentioned the ſhoes afterwards in either "way, with the ſame view of expreſſing his humility, rightly "expreſſed the Baptiſt's will and meaning [*a*]."

I ſhall not trouble the reader with any more inſtances of this kind, out of the great number, which has been collected by the writers on this ſubject: theſe which I have already produced, are ſufficient for my purpoſe, and the uſe, which I ſhall now procede to make of them.

In the firſt place then, they manifeſtly ſhew, that many of the facts, which are recorded in the Goſpels, are related ſo variouſly by the ſeveral Evangeliſts, that they cannot poſſibly be reconciled, or rendered conſiſtent by all the art and ſubtilty of the moſt expert Commentators. *Origen* declares, "that if any one carefully Origen
"examines the inconſiſtencies of the four Goſpels with regard to "hiſtorical facts,— he will find himſelf giddy, as it were, and giddy.
"no longer inſiſt on the truth of them all, but chuſe to adhere

---

[*a*] Non enim verbis, aut verborum ordine, aut aliquo genere locutionis, ſed etiam re ipſa videtur aliud eſſe, *calceamenta portare,* aliud, *corrigiam calceamenti ſolvere*— Si enim alterum horum dixit, ille verum videtur narraſſe, qui hoc potuit narrare quod dixit: qui autem aliud, etſi non eſt mentitus, certe vel oblitus, aliud pro alio dixiſſe putabitur. Omnem autem falſitatem abeſſe ab Evangeliſtis decet; non ſolum eam, quæ mentiendo promitur, ſed etiam eam, quæ obliviſcendo, &c. De Conſenſu Evangeliſt. l. 2. §. 29.

" to one of them ſingly, not daring wholly to reject the faith of " Chriſt; or elſe, if he admits them all, he muſt allow at the " ſame time, that the truth of them does not lie in the outward " character or letter of them [a]." It will be anſwered perhaps, that *Origen* was ſo addicted to the Allegorical ſenſe of Scripture, and ſo prejudiced in it's favor, as not to care, what abſurdities were charged upon the literal text, if he could but draw a myſtery out of it. But tho' this be granted, it will not invalidate his charge of inconſiſtency on the letter of the Goſpels; of which, by his indefatigable ſtudy of the Scriptures, he was of all men the moſt competent Judge; and it was the reality of this very charge, which gave birth to thoſe extravagant interpretations, in which he indulged himſelf [b].

Austin

St. Auſtin lays down a general rule for the ſolution of all theſe difficulties, which he earneſtly recommends to our attention and obſervance; " that whenever we find the Evangeliſts inconſiſtent, " in their accounts of any thing ſaid, or done by our Lord, we " are not to ſuppoſe them ſpeaking of the ſame thing, but of " ſome other, very like to it, ſaid or done at a different time. " For it is a *ſacrilegious vanity*, he ſays, to calumniate the " Goſpels, rather than believe the ſame thing to have been twice " performed, when no man can prove, that it could not really be " ſo: and when this rule fails, his next direction is, to take up " with any ſolution, rather than allow it as a conſequence, that " any of the Evangeliſts had been guilty either of a lie, or a " miſtake [c]." Which is nothing elſe in effect, but to require us,

No lie, or mistake.

---

[a] Comment. in Johan. T. 2. p. 151. Edit. Huet.

[b] Ego, in Scripturarum enarratione, unum Originem decem Orthodoxis antepoſuerim. Eraſm. in Gal. ii. 10.

[c] Quod commendare memoriæ diligenter debemus— ut ſi quando talia ſingula apud ſingulos invenerimus, atque in eis contrarium, quod ſolvi non poſſit, occurrat nobis, non hoc eſſe factum, ſed aliud ſimile— De Conſ. Evang. l. 2. §. 69.

Etiam atque etiam retinendum eſt, ſæpius Dominum eadem dixiſſe, ut quod exiſtente contrario ſolvi non potuerit, bis dictum intelligatur. Ib. l. 2. §. 106.

Calumniari autem Evangelio, dum non credit iterum factum, quod iterum fieri non potuiſſe nemo convincit, Sacrilegæ vanitatis eſt. Ib. §. 77.

Tantum

us, to adhere to Syſtems in oppoſition to facts, and to renounce our ſenſes, rather than our prejudices. His rule however has been religiouſly obſerved by the Commentators, who recurr to it on all occaſions, and declare the ſame thing to have been done twice or thrice, or till the repetition of it will clear up every difficulty, which diſturbs and perplexes them.

But the point, which I am affirming, is evidently proved, not onely by the facts and inſtances produced above, but by the very ſolutions and interpretations, which are given of them upon the contrary hypotheſis, which tho' contrived by men of the greateſt learning and ſagacity in all ages, are yet generally ſpeaking ſo forced and unnatural, that they betray themſelves, to be nothing elſe, but an artful defence of error. Whereas if they would but candidly own, as ſome few of them indeed have done, that the contradictions of the Evangeliſts, like to thoſe of all other Authors, were owing to want of accuracy in recording circumſtances of little moment; or to ſlips of memory, or to different informations, all would be eaſily and naturally accounted for, without any real offence or hurt to the authority of the Goſpel.

Inaccuracy: ſlips of Memory
different Information

For to run over again the ſeveral inſtances produced above; what advantage can the enemies of our religion draw from the difficulties, which are found in the two Genealogies? ſince they both of them agree, in affirming all, which a Chriſtian is concerned to believe on that article; *that Jeſus was of the ſeed of Abraham*; *of the family of David*; *and born in the fleſh of the Virgin Mary.* What can it ſignify to us, whether it was *one woman onely, or two,* who anointed *Jeſus*; or whether they anointed his head or his feet? ſince all that is inſtructive in the ſtory may be equally learnt in either caſe; from the woman, that extraordinary mercies ſhould produce a proportionable return of gratitude and love: from *Jeſus*, a prediction, which we ſee accompliſhed at this day; *that the zeal of this woman ſhould be propa-*

Tantum non putes conſequens eſſe, ut quilibet Evangeliſtarnm mentitus ſit, aut in tanto & tam ſancto culmine auctoritatis erraverit. De Conſ. Evang. l. 3. §. 43.

gated with his Goſpel over the face of the earth [a]. Of what conſequence can it be, that *Judas*'s treachery is told with ſome variation by the different Evangeliſts? ſince all, that is of ſervice to religion, is equally clear in them all; that *Jeſus* foretold to his Diſciples both the Traitor and his treaſon, that when it ſhould come to paſs, *they might believe him to be the Chriſt* [b]. Of what uſe could it be to know, whether it was *one or two* poſſeſſed with Devils; and *one or two* blind, whom *Jeſus* cured, and whether it happened, as he was going or as he was returning from *Jericho?* it is enough to be aſſured, that all kinds of diſeaſes yielded equally to his power, and were cured by the word of his mouth. Laſtly, what if the Evangeliſts do not agree about the preciſe time of his crucifixion; whether it was at *the third* or *the ſixth hour*: or in the ſtory of his reſurrection, whether *one or two Angels* appeared; whether *ſitting* or *ſtanding*; or whether *before or after Peter's coming* to the Sepulchre? it is ſufficient, that they agree, in confirming all the principal circumſtances, and in declaring them to have been accompanied with ſuch prodigies, as were ſuitable to the dignity and importance of thoſe great events.

Theophylact.

Nay, all theſe differences and inconſiſtencies are ſo far from reflecting any diſcredit on Chriſtianity, that on the contrary, they are found to be of real ſervice, towards illuſtrating the truth of it. *This very thing*, ſays *Theophylact*, *gives a ſtronger proof of the integrity of the Evangeliſts, that they have not agreed in all points: for otherwiſe, they might have been ſuſpected to have written by compact* [c]. But while they really tend to eſtabliſh the authority of the Evangeliſts, they clearly overthrow that hypotheſis, which is commonly entertained concerning them, that in compiling their ſeveral Goſpels, *they were conſtantly inſpired and directed by an unerring Spirit*. This, I ſay, is evident, as well from the facts above ſtated, as from the expreſs declarations of the Evangeliſts themſelves, who are ſo far from pretending to any ſuch privilege,

Not constantly directed by an unerring Spirit.

---

[a] Matt. xxvi. 13.

[b] Joh. xiii. 19.

[c] Δι' αὐτὸ γὰρ τοῦτο μᾶλλον ἀληθεύουσιν, ὅτι μὴ κατὰ πάντα ὠμοφώνησαν, &c. Theophyl. Proœm. in Matt.

that they in effect diſclame it, placing their whole credit on a foundation, merely human and common to all other writers; on their knowledge of the truth of what they deliver, and on their fidelity in delivering it to the beſt of their knowledge.

Their Credit merely human

Luke profeſſes, that he had received all the principal facts of his Goſpel, *from thoſe, who had been eye-witneſſes and actors in them; from whom he had got a perfect information of all things from the very beginning* [a]. *John* declares, *that he himſelf ſaw, and was preſent at all the tranſactions, which he relates: that he knew them therefore to be true, and recorded them, that others alſo might know and believe them:* which declaration he repeats in the end of his Goſpel, as the ſeal of it's veracity [b]. And this is the ſame profeſſion, which is made by all other Hiſtorians, in order to procure credit to what they relate. *Herodotus* declares in ſeveral places, *that he writes from his own knowledge and eye-ſight:* and in others, *from the beſt information, which he could get:* and *Thucydides* tells us, like *John, that he himſelf was preſent* at many of the tranſactions recorded by him, and in others, like *Luke, that he had done every thing in his power, to procure an exact account of them from thoſe, who had been actors in them* [c]. And this likewiſe is the foundation, on which the Advocates of Chriſtianity, both antient and modern, have conſtantly put the credibility of the Evangelical hiſtory; that the Authors of it were, either eye-witneſſes of it themſelves, or wrote from the information of thoſe, who were. Which reaſoning, as ſolid and rational as it has been thought in all ages, yet, upon the hypotheſis of a perpetual inſpiration, would be wholly trifling and impertinent; ſince it could not be of any moment, whether they knew any thing or nothing of the matters related by them, if as ſome vainly imagine, they were but *mere organs or pipes*, through which God

Heroditus

Thucidides.

Eye Witnesses or Hearsay Witnesses

not mere Pipes.

---

[a] Luc. i. 1, 2.

[b] Joh. xix. 35: xxi. 24: 1 Ep. i. 1, 2, 3.

[c] Τὰ δὲ αὐτοὶ θεησάμενοι λέγομεν, τῶν μὲν κάτω ἀκοῇ παραλαβόντες. Herod. l. 2. p. 147. Edit. Lond.

Οἷς αὐτὸς τὲ παρῆν, καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δύνατον ἀκριβείᾳ περὶ ἑκάστου ἐπεξέλθων. Thucyd. l. 1. p. 13. Ed. Oxon.

thought fit to convey the knowledge of certain extraordinary facts and divine truths to the world [a].

The Septuagint not inspired

It was once thought neceſſary, for the honor of the Greek tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, called the *Septuagint*, to believe, “ that it was divinely inſpired and dictated by God: and that ſeventy perſons ſhut up ſeparately in as many different cells, produced their ſeveral tranſlations, all agreeing to a tittle with each other, both in the ſenſe and the words.” This, though affirmed by all the primitive Fathers, as well as by many of the learned moderns, is now univerſally conſidered, as an undoubted fiction, contrived for the ſake of conciliating the greater reverence to that antient verſion; which was read, inſtead of the original Hebrew, in all the Synagogues of the Helleniſtic Jews [b]. For beſides the abſurdities, which are charged upon this ſtory, and the impertinence of recurring to a miracle, where there was no occaſion for it, and where nothing was wanted to make ſuch a tranſlation, but a competent ſkill in two languages, the many imperfections of the verſion itſelf confute the pretence of it's divine origin. The caſe is the ſame with the Goſpels: the hypotheſis of their inſpiration was piouſly invented, to reflect the greater luſter upon them, where there was not the leaſt want of it: ſince nothing more is required to eſtabliſh their authority, than to know, as we do in this caſe, that the compilers of them were perfectly informed of all the important facts, which they had undertaken to relate, and zealous to publiſh them for the common benefit of mankind: while many little omiſſions and inaccuracies, which

Read in the Synagogues of the Hellenistic Jews.

Inspiration invented

---

[a] Spiritus Sancti, cujus ipſi erant organa. Caſaub. Exercit. 15. ad Baron. Ann. 12.

Ita nimirum, ut non ſolum ſententiæ, ſed & verba ſingula & verborum ordo ac tota diſpoſitio ſit a Deo, tanquam per ſemetipſum loquente. — Eſtius. in 2 Tim. iii. 16.

Litterulam unam aut notham eſſe, aut inſcio Evangeliſta irrepſiſſe nego. Lightfoot, in Matt. xxvii. 9.

[b] Traditur ſane mirabilem, planeque divinum in eorum verbis fuiſſe conſenſum, ut cum ad hoc opus ſeparatim ſinguli ſederint, ita enim eorum fidem Ptolomæo placuit explorare, in nullo verbo, vel verborum ordine alter ab altero diſcreparet, &c. Auguſt. de Civ. D. l. 18. c. 42. See this ſtory related at large and confuted in Dr. Prideaux's Connect. Vol. 2. p. 21.

are obſervable in their ſeveral narratives, clearly ſhew, that they could not be guided by a divine and infallible ſpirit. But this will be made ſtill more evident, by conſidering, what the Antients have delivered to us concerning them.

Matthew, as the primitive writers generally agree, wrote his Goſpel the firſt, and in *the Hebrew tongue:* which, for that reaſon, could not be of general uſe, nor hardly indeed any farther, than to the inhabitants of *Jeruſalem*, where it was publiſhed: for the Greek language was uſed at that time not onely by the Jews, even in their own country, but was the univerſal language *of the Eaſt* [a]. This original Goſpel then being of little or no ſervice beyond the precincts of *Jeruſalem*, was ſoon laid aſide, and within a few ages afterwards quite loſt; and a Greek tranſlation of it made by *ſome body unknown*, took it's place very early, and was received in all Churches, as it is at this day, with a credit and authority equal to that of an Original. In which, tho' the Tranſlator may be preſumed to have been both faithful and equal to the taſk, yet, for any thing that we know, he may have been guilty of ſome miſtakes, as *St. Jerom* ſuppoſes him to have actually been, and endeavours to ſhew, in one particular inſtance [b].

Matthew in Hebrew

Greek Universal in the East

Greek by Somebody unknown.

Mark followed *Matthew*; and perceiving, as we may imagine, in his travels, that an Hiſtory of our Saviour's life and acts was every where wanted and greedily deſired, by the new converts, he wrote his Goſpel, under the direction, as it is believed, of *St. Peter*, whoſe diſciple he was: in which, tho' he has made ſome few variations, as well as additions to the former Goſpel of

Mark

Peter

---

[a] Solus Matthæus Hebræo ſcripſiſſe perhibetur eloquio, ceteri Græco. Aug. de Conſ. Evang. l. 1. §. 4.

Primus Matthæus Evangelium in Judæa Hebræo Sermone edidit. Hieron. Procem. in Matth. Vid. Græcor. Patrum teſtimonia de Matthæo a Millio collect. in Edit. N. T.

—Excepto ſermone Græco, quo omnis Oriens loquitur. Hieron. in Epiſt. ad Galat. Op. T. 4. p. 255. Vid. Lightf. Hor. Heb. in Matth. 1.

[b] Quod quis poſtea in Græcum tranſtulerit non ſatis certum. Hieron. de Scriptorib. Eccleſ. in Matt.

Mihi videtur Matthæum, qui Evangelium Hebraico ſermone conſcripſit, non tam *veſpere* dixiſſe, quam *ſero*; & eum, qui interpretatus eſt, verbi ambiguitate deceptum, non *ſero*, interpretatum eſſe, ſed *veſpere*. Ad Hedib. T. 4. par. 1. p. 173.

Epitomy of Matthew.

Matthew, yet he agrees with it ſo exactly in moſt particulars, that as it is ſaid above, he is thought by the Commentators to have done little more than epitomize it [*a*].

Luke. of Antioch

Paul.

Luke comes next, a Phyſician of *Antioch*, and a convert probably from paganiſm: who perceiving, that many others had publiſhed accounts, either falſe or imperfect, concerning the life and actions of *Jeſus*, thought it neceſſary to write a third Goſpel, under the direction, as it is thought, of *St. Paul*; and to the intent, as he himſelf declares, that the new Chriſtians might be informed of the certain truth of thoſe things, in which they had been inſtructed, and of which he had procured a perfect information from thoſe, who had been eye-witneſſes. But as he wrote at ſecond hand and from hearſay onely, of things, which he himſelf had not ſeen, he is obſerved to have jumbled his facts together more confuſedly, and deſcribed them more inaccurately, than the reſt, who related them from their own knowledge [*b*].

[*a*] Marcus eum ſubſecutus, breviator ejus videtur. Auguſt. de Conſenſ. Evan. l. 1. §. 4.

Ut ſæpe ei præſtet interpretis vicem. Grot. in Matt. xxviii. 1.

[*b*] Vid. Teſtimonia Græcor. de Luca a Millio collecta.

Evangelium, ſicut audierat, ſcripſit; Acta vero Apoſtolorum, ſicut viderat. Hieron. de Scriptorib. Eccleſ.

Apparet illum non ſemel ob rerum cohærentiam, connexuiſſe quæ temporibus erant diſcreta, quod ſuis locis patefiet. Grot. in Luc. i. ver. 3.

Luke, who wrote his ſtory from collections, which he had from others, and compiled it himſelf, hath not ſo exactly obſerved the order, wherein the things were done, &c. Hammond. Pref. in Matt.

N. B. This account of *Luke* may help us to ſolve that difficulty in the Martyr *Stephen*'s ſpeech, [Act. vii. 16.] in which it is ſaid, that *the Patriarchs were buried in Sichem, in the Sepulcher, which Abraham bought of the Sons of Emmor*: whereas, it was not *Abraham*, but *Jacob*, who bought that Sepulcher: and the Sepulcher, which *Abraham* purchaſed, was in a different place, and bought of a different perſon; *Ephron the Hittite, the Son of Zohar*. [Gen. xxiii. it. xxxiii. 19. it. Joſh. xxiv. 32.] This paſſage then, as it now ſtands in the book of the Acts, is a manifeſt contradiction to the truth of hiſtory, as all the Critics acknowledge; ſome of whom have attempted to give an emendation of the text, but to no purpoſe, ſince the conſent of all the copies in all ages effectually eſtabliſhes the preſent reading: others have ſeverally offered the beſt ſolutions, which they could invent, yet all of them forced and ridiculous, and no body, beſides *Cappellus*, has ventured to intimate, that it might poſſibly be *a ſlip of memory in Stephen* himſelf. Vid. Cappelli Not. in Act. vii. 16.

John publiſhed his Goſpel, the laſt of the four, to ſupply the defects and imperfections of the other three; moved to it, as the Primitive Fathers inform us, “ by the earneſt ſollicitation of his “ friends and of all the Biſhops of *Aſia*, who were perſuaded, “ that ſuch an hiſtory from him, would be of more ſervice, and “ more likely to gain credit, than any, which were already pub- “ liſhed. Whereupon, at their requeſt, having read over the “ other Goſpels, he confirmed in general the truth of them, yet “ obſerved, that many things of conſequence were either wholly “ omitted or too ſlightly touched in them; eſpecially the actions “ of *Jeſus*, which preceded the death of *John the Baptiſt*, and “ almoſt all thoſe miracles, which deſerved the moſt to be re- “ corded, and were the propereſt for inſtruction; and above all, “ the declaration of his divinity and exiſtence, prævious to his “ birth at *Bethlehem*. For which reaſons, as all the Antients af- “ firm, he undertook at laſt, with ſome reluctance, to write his “ own Goſpel in a very advanced age:” which on that account *Grotius* calls *a collection of things, omitted by the other three.* And thus, as a writer of Antiquity obſerves, “ we have now a com- “ plete and perfect hiſtory of the Life and Acts of *Jeſus*: for “ what was not taken notice of by *Matthew*, is recorded by “ *Mark*: what was forgotten by *Mark*, is added by *Luke*: and “ what was omitted ſtill by all the three, is ſupplied by *John* [a].”

John

Bishops of Asia.

Preceding the death of John the Baptist.

Declaration of his Divinity and Pre Existence.

This

But it does not ſeem probable, that a perſon *full of the Holy Ghoſt*, as *Stephen* is ſaid to have been, and who appears alſo, from this very ſpeech, to have been greatly converſant with the *Moſaic* writings, ſhould be capable of committing ſuch a blunder, which may eaſily and naturally be accounted for by aſcribing it to *Luke*, the compiler of *the Acts*; who being a late convert from Paganiſm, and but imperfectly acquainted with the Jewiſh learning and hiſtory, might eaſily miſtake in the names of perſons, and confound two facts ſo nearly reſembling each other. So that *Cappellus* might, with as much reaſon, have charged *Luke* with a miſtake here, as he has actually done elſewhere, in the caſe of *Theudas*, the Impoſtor, who according to *Joſephus*, did not make his appearance, till ſeveral years after that time, in which *Luke* introduces him. Acts vii. 16. vid. Cappelli not.

Theudas

[a] Coactus eſt ab omnibus pene tunc Aſiæ Epiſcopis, & multarum Eccleſiarum legationibus de divinitate Salvatoris altiùs ſcribere, &c. Hieron. Prolog. in Matt.— Vid.

Goſpels not divinely inspired.

4 Winds.

This is the Summ of what primitive Antiquity has delivered, concerning the hiſtory of the Goſpels: which is utterly inconſiſtent with the notion of their being divinely inſpired: for if any one of them had been a perfect work, as every work muſt needs be, which is directed by the Spirit of God, there had been no uſe or want of the reſt; nor would they in reality have been written: unleſs we can believe, with ſome of the Primitive Fathers, *that it was neceſſary, that there ſhould be four: becauſe there are four elements; four climates; four cardinal winds; four cardinal virtues*, &c. [*a*].

Infallibility of Evangelists more absurd than Transubstantiation,

The belief then of *the Inſpiration and abſolute infallibility of the Evangeliſts*, ſeems to be more abſurd, than even of Tranſubſtantiation itſelf: for this, tho' repugnant to ſenſe, is ſupported by the expreſs words of Scripture; whereas the other, not leſs contrary to ſenſe, is contrary at the ſame time to the declarations of the Evangeliſts themſelves. Yet ſuch is the force of prejudice, that the generality of Expoſitors take great pains to ſearch out texts and arguments for the ſupport of this favorite hypotheſis; not conſidering, that if they were able to produce any, from which they could extort ſuch an interpretation, it would tend onely to the hurt and diſcredit of Chriſtianity itſelf, by faſtening upon it a doctrine, contradictory to fact and experience.

ἄνωθεν

But in truth, all the arguments which are alledged for this doctrine, are generally ſo trifling, that inſtead of confirming, they render it onely more contemptible to men of judgement. Thus the learned *Lightfoot* attempts to prove the divine inſpiration of *Luke*, from the word ἄνωθεν, in the preface of his Goſpel, which implies, as is interpreted by this Critic, that *Luke* had received his information of the things, which he relates, *from above or from heaven* [*b*]: whereas it ſignifies nothing more, but that he had ſearched,

---

Vid. Teſtimonia Patrum Græcor. de *Johanne*, a Millio collecta—

Additum a Johanne, in hac quaſi pretermiſſorum collectione. Grot. in Joh.

[*a*] Quatuor, quoniam quatuor ſunt partes Orbis terræ, &c. Auguſt. de Conſ. Evang. l. 1. §. 3. it. vid. Irenæum. l. 3. c. 11. Theophyl. Proœm. in Matth.

[*b*] Aſſecuto omnia cœlitus vel e ſupernis— Hunc ſenſum nos amplectimur: utpote

ſearched and traced them out from their very ſource, or beginning: in which ſenſe it is frequently applied by all the beſt writers of antiquity, and even by *Luke* himſelf in another place [a].

I ſhall not dwell therefore any longer on the proof of this point; which from the facts above recited, and the profeſſions of the Evangeliſts themſelves, as well as the accounts, which are given of them by the antients, ſeems evident to a demonſtration; but ſhall procede, as I at firſt propoſed, to conſider, what uſe may be made of the opinion here affirmed, in the controverſies, which have been agitated, concerning *the grounds of Chriſtianity*, Between Collins and Whiston and eſpecially in thoſe, which relate to *the prophecies of the Old Teſtament*, as they are cited and applied in the New.

Soon after *Jeſus* had entered upon his miniſtry, and gathered to himſelf a number of Diſciples, he choſe out of them, twelve, to be his immediate companions and conſtant attendants during his reſidence on earth, and after his aſcenſion into heaven, to be the principal inſtruments of publiſhing his religion to all nations. Theſe were called his Apoſtles; perſons of the loweſt condition of life, chiefly Fiſhermen; void of every ornament and advantage, which learning, art, and languages uſually add to the characters and faculties of men: and choſen by their Maſter, for this very reaſon, that the triumphs of his Goſpel might be the more conſpicuous, in ſubduing all the powers and wiſdom of the world by the miniſtry of perſons ſo abject and deſpicable. The Jews in the mean while, to whom the Goſpel was in the firſt place propoſed, were zealouſly fond of their old religion, and on that account, ſtrongly prejudiced againſt his new one: and being forbidden by their law, to give credit even to miracles, when wrought in favour of doctrines, which ſeemed to contradict the inſtitutions of *Moſes*, were the more jealous, and on their guard againſt this new Prophet; leſt by his mighty works, he might lead the people aſtray from their antient worſhip. Wherefore

---

pote quod extra omnem controverſiam ſit, eum cœleſti afflatu calamum dirigente ea ſcripſiſſe, quæ ſcripſit. Vid. Hor. Hebraic. in Luc. i. & in Act. i.

[a] Vid. Eraſm. & Grot. in Luc. i. 3. it. in Act. xxvi. 5.

Jesus not
come to destroy but fulfill
the Law.

Jeſus, in order to remove their ſcruples, and calm their apprehenſions, took all occaſions to convince them, that he was not come *to deſtroy, but to fulfill their law*; that he was the *very Meſſiah*, whom *Moſes and the Prophets* had foretold and prepared them to expect; and that his character and commiſſion were clearly deſcribed and prefigured to them in their own books, to which he appealed, as the witneſſes of his veracity [*a*].

This was the general doctrine of *Jeſus:* but the Evangeliſts have recorded but very few of the particular prophecies, which he applied, to the confirmation of it: the event however ſhews, that it was ſo well ſupported by him, as to have great weight with many of the Jews.

The Apoſtles then, having been ſpecially inſtructed in this point by their Maſter, before his death, and more clearly ſtill after his reſurrection, no ſooner entered upon their miniſtry, than they made this, as they were commanded [*b*], the chief ſubject of their preaching; *that the perſon and character of Jeſus were deſcribed and foretold by the law and the Prophets:* by the force of which argument the Apoſtle *Peter*, in one of his firſt ſermons, is ſaid to have converted *three thouſand ſouls* [*c*]. The reſt of the Apoſtles, as we may imagine, were not leſs zealous and active, in publiſhing the ſame doctrine, both by preaching and writing: and *Matthew* eſpecially, who wrote his Goſpel for the particular information of the Jews, appears to have been more diligent than any of them, in ſearching the old Scriptures for paſſages, which in any ſenſe could be applied to ſome circumſtance or action of *Jeſus*'s life: and like all other men warmly perſuaded, and fond of a new hypotheſis, ſeems to have ſtrained it in a few inſtances, farther than it would naturally reach, and to have applied it even to ſome, to which it has no relation at all.

Mr. *Whiſton*, of whoſe piety and zeal for the honor of Chriſtianity no man can doubt, has freely and candidly owned, *that*

[*a*] Matt. v. 17. Joh. v. 39, 45, 46, &c.

[*b*] Act. x. 42.

[*c*] Act. ii. 41.

the Apoſtles might poſſibly be ſuppoſed, to have been miſtaken ſometimes in their applications of theſe prophecies [a]. If their inſpiration therefore, or infallibility was thrown out of this quæſtion, what I am here ſaying of *Matthew*, would readily be admitted; that, out of zeal for an Hypotheſis, of whoſe truth he was aſſured, he might be apt, like all other men, to ſtretch it to caſes, to which it did not belong. This is allowed with regard to the *Jewiſh Doctors*, by an ingenious and orthodox Defender of Chriſtianity, who ſays; "that under the ſtrong expectations, which "they entertained of *the coming of a Meſſiah*, it may well be ſuppoſed, that the learned among them had, with more than ordinary attention, ſearched the prophetic writings for marks and "deſignations of him, and might probably apprehend him to be "delineated in ſome paſſages, which had no relation to him. If "we conſider the obſcurity of the prophecies before their completion; how apt a man, who reads ſuch writings with an intention to one point, would be, to fancy a relation to it, and with "what fondneſs he would entertain any appearance of ſo reputable a diſcovery; it can ſcarce be imagined, but that inſtances "of this kind muſt have happened [b]." What this writer thinks ſo probable of the learned Doctors of the Jews, muſt needs appear more probable of the Apoſtles, who were not learned: who, as I have ſhewn elſewhere, being liable to ſlight miſtakes, and inadvertencies, in the repreſentation of plain and ordinary events, may more reaſonably be preſumed to be ſo, in the interpretation of dark prophecies. But as it is not my deſign to inquire into probabilities, but into facts, ſo I ſhall lay before the reader two or three examples of *Matthew*'s method of citing and applying the *prophecies of the Old Teſtament* to the tranſactions of the New.

Thus, ſays he, it is written by the Prophet; *And thou* Bethlehem *in the land of* Judah, *art by no means the leaſt among the Princes of* Judah, *for out of thee ſhall come a Governor, who ſhall rule my people* Iſrael. But the words of the Prophet are; *But thou*

---

[a] See his Litteral Accompliſhment, p. 20. §. x.

[b] Dr. Rogers' Serm. 5. p. 123.

Bethlehem Ephratah, *though thou be little among the thouſands of* Judah, *yet out of thee*, &c. [a]. *St. Jerom* obſerves on this place, " that there is a ſtrange difference between *Matthew* and the " Septuagint-tranſlation of the Bible, but a ſtranger ſtill between " him and the Hebrew text, for he agrees with neither of them " either in the words or the ſenſe." And he ſuggeſts two reaſons for this diſagreement; " that *Matthew* might probably intend, by " this way of applying Scripture, to reprove the *Scribes and Pha-* " *riſees*, who uſed the ſame negligent manner of interpreting it: " or elſe, that the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles did not cite the paſ- " ſages of the Old Teſtament from books, but from their me- " mories, which ſometimes failed them, and gave riſe to thoſe " variations, which are found among them in the order, and in " the words, and ſometimes alſo in the ſenſe [b]."

Jerom

A ſtrange difference

Modern Commentators are generally more cautious of charging the leaſt ſuſpicion of a miſtake on the Evangeliſt, tho' they cannot reconcile his meaning with that of the Prophet: but *Eraſmus* laughs at the weakneſs of thoſe, " who take the authority of the " Scriptures to be endangered by the allowance of an error in " them, and declares; that the divine Spirit, who governed the " minds of the Apoſtles, ſuffered them on ſome occaſions to err, " through ignorance, affection, or wrong judgement, without " any real detriment to the credit of the Goſpel [c]."

Erasmus

Matthew having ſhewn the place of our Saviour's birth to have been foretold by the Prophets, procedes to ſhew the ſame alſo, concerning the place of his habitation. *He came*, ſays he, *and dwelt in a City called* Nazareth, *that it might be fulfilled, which*

---

[a] Matt. ii. 5, 6. Micah. v. 2.

[b] Quanta ſit inter Matthæum & Septuaginta, verborum ordiniſque diſcordia, ſic magis admiraberis, ſi Hebraicum videas — ſenſuſque contrarius eſt, Septuaginta ſibi hoc in loco & Hebraico concordante. — Hieron. de Opt. gen. interpret. T. 4. par. 2. p. 253. — It. Ejuſdem Comm. in Micah. v. T. 3. p. 531.

[c] Neque enim continuo vacillet totius Scripturæ auctoritas, ſicubi variet vel in verbis vel in ſenſu—Spiritus ille divinus mentium Apoſtolicarum moderator paſſus eſt ſuos ignorare quædam & labi, &c. in Matt. ii. 6.

Nazarene

was ſpoken by the Prophets, He ſhall be called a Nazarene [a]. Now it is agreed by all, that the paſſage cited here by *Matthew*, as delivered by the Prophets, is not to be found in any Prophet or writer of the Old Teſtament whatſoever: and it is pleaſant to ſee, to what ridiculous ſhifts the Commentators are driven, in their attempts to account for it [b]. They firſt adapt ſome particular ſenſes of their own to the word, *Nazarene*, in which ſtill they all differ from each other, and then labor to ſhew, that in one or other of thoſe ſenſes, it may be collected from ſeveral diſperſed paſſages, and obſcure hints found in different parts of the Old Teſtament. *Grotius* tells us, *that when the Evangeliſts cite the Prophets, in this looſe and general manner, it frequently indicates a ſenſe, picked up from many ſeparate paſſages of the Old Teſtament, rather than from any ſingle text* [c]. Yet no man has ever pretended to make out from any or all thoſe different texts, that ſenſe of the word *Nazarene*, which is here applied by *Matthew*, to denote *an inhabitant of* Nazareth. *The difficulty is*, ſays Dr. *Hammond*, *how his dwelling at* Nazareth *ſhould be ſaid to be the completion of a prophecy, which relates not at all to his dwelling there* [d]. *The learned*, ſays *Heinſius*, *have taken ſuch pains about this paſſage, that whole books have been written upon it; yet not one writer has been able to hit upon any thing, which could ſatisfy even himſelf* [e].

Again; *Then was fulfilled*, ſays *Matthew*, *that which was ſpoken by* Jeremiah *the Prophet, ſaying; and they took the thirty pieces of ſilver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of* Iſrael *did value, and gave them for the Potter's field, as the Lord appointed me* [f]. This prophecy, as all the Expoſitors allow, is not to be found in the Prophet *Jeremiah*, from whom it is expreſsly cited. “ Something like to it, ſays *Jerom*, is to be met “ with in *Zachariah*; which, tho' not differing much in ſenſe, “ yet varies greatly in the words, and in the order of them. I “ have ſeen however, adds he, this very text word for word, in “ *an apocryphal book of* Jeremiah, which a Jew lately ſhewed “ me: yet the prophecy ſeems rather to have been taken from “ *Zachariah* [*a*].” He was unwilling to impute here to *Matthew*, the practice of citing his prophetical teſtimonies from *apocryphal* books; which yet others, both among the antients and moderns, have not ſcrupled to affirm likewiſe very freely of *St. Paul*, and the other Apoſtles [*b*]. It is obſerved by the Critics, that ſome few copies of the New Teſtament, in the early ages, had not the word *Jeremiah* in this text; which they ſuppoſe to have been omitted deſignedly by the Tranſcribers, for the ſake of clearing *Matthew* from the imputation of a miſtake: as *Auſtin* himſelf, from the conſent of the beſt Greek copies, is forced to allow [*c*]; tho' of all the primitive Fathers, he ſeems the

---

[a] Matt. ii. 23.

[b] This text, ſays Mr. *Whiſton*, is intirely wanting in all our Copies, Hebrew and Greek, nor do there at preſent the leaſt footſteps of it remain, ſince the Jews corrupted their Copies.—See Eſſay on the O. T. p. 104. it. The Litteral Accompliſhment of Script. Prophecies, p. 4.

[c] Sæpe ſenſum multis ex locis depromptum, magis quam unius loci verba indicat. &c. Grot. in loc.

[d] Hammond in loc.

[e] Heinſii Exercitat. Sacr. in loc.

[f] Matt. xxvii. 9, 10.

Jerom

Apocryphal Book of Jeremiah.

Paul and the other Apostles cited Apocryphal Books.

Austin

[*a*] Hoc teſtimonium in *Jeremiah* non invenitur: in *Zachariah* vero quædam ſimilitudo fertur: & quanquam ſenſus non multum diſcrepet, tamen & ordo & verba diverſa ſunt. Legi nuper in quodam Hebraico volumine, quod mihi Hebræus obtulit, *Jeremiæ Apocryphum*, in quo hæc ad verbum ſcripta reperi. Sed tamen mihi videtur magis de *Zacharia* ſumptum teſtimonium. in Matt. xxvii. T. 4. p. 134.

[*b*] Ut omittam longas & varias inquiſitiones quibus hunc locum nonnulli interpretum involvunt hoc mihi ſimpliciſſimum judicatur, ut dicamus Evangeliſtam *ex apocrypho quodam Jeremiæ volumine* hoc deſumpſiſſe teſtimonium, &c. Vid. Zeger. in Matt. xxvii. 9. Vid. it. Grotium in loc.

Zacharias, Chryſopolitanus Epiſcopus, p. 343. teſtatur ſe hoc teſtimonium inveniſſe in *ſecretis Eliæ Prophetæ*, qui liber eſt Apocryphus, non Canonicus. Eadem ſcribit Georgius Syncellus, cujus verba invenies apud Scaligerum in notis ad Euſebium, de Apoſtolo etiam Paulo libros Apocryphos citante. Druſius, in 1 Ep. ad Corinth. ii. 9. it. Zeger. ibid.—Vid. etiam de Chriſto Apocryphis utente. Orig. Comm. in Matt. p. 225. Edit. Huet.

[*c*] Vid. Millii Notas in loc. it. Grot. ibid.

Qui diligentius in Græcis Codicibus Evangelium conſideraverunt, in antiquioribus Græcis ita ſe perhibent inveniſſe—cur autem de nonnullis Codicibus tolleretur, audax imperitia fecit, cum turbaretur quæſtione, quod hoc teſtimonium apud Jeremiam non inveniretur. Auguſt. de Conſ. Evang. l. 3. §. 29.

Jerom

Grotius

Elias

Paul

Christ

Austin

moſt bigotted to the notion, *that the Evangeliſts could not err.* To heal this difficulty therefore, he gives us two ſolutions of his own invention, but both of them ſtrangely abſurd and ridiculous.

Evangelists could not err.

First; he ſays, "that *Matthew* was directed by the Holy Spirit, "to commit this miſtake of putting *Jeremiah* for *Zachariah*; "which upon recollection, he would ſurely have corrected, if he "had not been convinced, that it was ſuggeſted by the ſecret "counſil of Providence for wiſe purpoſes. For ſince all the "Prophets were inſpired by one and the ſame Spirit, and had "but one and the ſame view in their writings, people would ſee "by this inſtance, that it was wholly indifferent, which of them "was named or cited, for what was ſaid by any of them; and "that the ſayings of *Zachariah* were as much *Jeremiah*'s as *Zachariah*'s, and ſo vice verſa; ſo that there was no occaſion for "*Matthew*, to correct this ſeeming blunder, when he knew himſelf, at the time of making it, to be under the direction of the "Holy Ghoſt [a]."

The holy Spirit committed this blunder, on purpose!

2dly, He obſerves, "that there is an account in *Jeremiah*, "how the Prophet bought a field of his Uncle's ſon; not indeed "for *thirty pieces of ſilver*, for theſe are mentioned onely by *Zachariah*, as the purchaſe of a field is mentioned onely by *Jeremiah*: the reader therefore finding *Jeremiah* cited in the Goſpel, and not finding in *Jeremiah*, the *thirty pieces of ſilver*, "which are added by *Matthew*, might thence be admoniſhed, "that theſe alſo were applicable to *Jeſus*, and ſo come at the ſenſe "of another prophecy, which was myſtically related to him." As to the reſt of this text in *Matthew*; *the price of him, that was valued, whom they of the children of* Iſrael *did value, and gave them for the Potter's field, as the Lord appointed me.* "It is not, "as he ſays, to be found, either in *Zachariah* or *Jeremiah*, but "was myſtically and elegantly added by the *Evangeliſt*, who had "learnt from Chriſt himſelf, that it related to *the thirty pieces of* "*ſilver*, for which he was ſold: for as the price of the field

Is not this, making the Evangelist, and Christ too as errant Sophists and Punsters as the holy Father was himself?

---

[a] Ibid. §. 30.

“ in *Jeremiah* is ſaid, to have been put into an earthen veſſel, ſo “ the price of *Jeſus* was applied to the purchaſe of a Potter’s “ field [*a*].”

This explication was too extravagant, to be followed, as uſual, by modern Commentators: who account therefore for this difficulty, by ſuppoſing either ſome inadvertency of the firſt tranſcribers, in putting *Jeremiah* for *Zachariah*; or *a ſlip of memory* in *Matthew* himſelf, or, what is more probable, that the paſſage was cited from that *apocryphal book of Jeremiah*, in which St. *Jerom* had read it *word for word:* which they ſhew, to have been the caſe likewiſe of many other paſſages of the New Teſtament [*b*]. *Jerom* indeed tells us, “ that when we meet with any citations “ made by the Apoſtles, as from the Prophets, which cannot be “ found in the Old Teſtament, we muſt not recurr preſently *to* “ *the abſurdities of apocryphal books*, but believe them to be really “ written in the old Scriptures, yet cited by the Apoſtles, not according to the words, but to the meaning of them; ſo that it “ cannot eaſily be diſcovered, in what part of the Scriptures they “ are written, except by the learned and ſtudious [*c*].” And to ſay the truth; the learned may draw what ſenſes they pleaſe out of any book whatſoever, by the ſame method, with which they have made out the ſenſe of the paſſages now before us.

Jerom

Matthew.

Laſtly, *Matthew* ſpeaking of *Jeſus* ſays; *He caſt out Spirits with his word, and healed all that were ſick; that it might be ful-*

Aug.

[*a*] Auguſt. de Conſ. Evang. l. 3. §. 30.

Erasmus

[*b*] Aut enim culpa Scribarum commutatum nomen aut memoriæ vitio. Eraſm. in Matt xxvii. 8.

Beza. Lightfoot

Jeremiæ nomen irrepſiſſe videtur, vel culpa exſcribentis, vel memoriæ vitio. Druſius. ibid. Vid. it. Bezam. Lightfoot.

Evangelist

Paul

Hoc mihi ſimpliciſſimum videtur, Evangeliſtam ex Apocrypho quodam Jeremiæ volumine ſumſiſſe teſtimonium, & idem quoque Apoſtolum Paulum feciſſe. Zeger. ib. Tale Enochi illud apud Judam. [14, 15.] tale illud. [1 Cor. ii. 9.] Grot. ibid.

instar omnium Judis Enoch, what Systems
have grown out of this Enoch?

Jerem.

[*c*] Hoc autem totum nunc idcirco obſervavimus, ut etiam in ceteris locis, ſicubi teſtimonia quaſi de Prophetis, & de veteri Teſtamento ab Apoſtolis uſurpata ſunt, & in noſtris Codicibus non habentur, nequaquam ſtatim ad Apocryphorum ineptias & deliramenta curramus; ſed ſciamus ſcripta ea quidem eſſe in Veteri Teſtamento, ſed non ita ab Apoſtolis edita, &c. in Epiſt. ad Epheſ. Op. T. 4. p. 392.

filled, which was ſpoken by Iſaiah, *ſaying*; *himſelf took our infirmities and bare our ſickneſſes* [*a*]. *Eraſmus* remarks here, “ that, Erasmus
“ in the application of this prophecy, *Matthew* has wreſted it a Mathew interpolates a little!
“ little to his own purpoſe [*b*].” It is taken from the 53d chapter of *Iſaiah*, where the Prophet is deſcribing the character of *a ſuffering Meſſiah*, who was to take our ſins upon him, and give himſelf up to death for the expiation of them: to which ſenſe *Jeſus* himſelf often alludes, declaring, *that he came to give his life a ranſom for many, and that his blood was ſhed for many, for the remiſſion of ſins* [*c*]. And to this ſenſe all the other Apoſtles conſtantly apply it; telling us; how *Jeſus bare our ſins, in his own body, on the tree*; *was offered for the ſins of many*; *was the Lamb ſlain, and propitiation made for the ſins of the whole world* [*d*]. But what the Prophet had foretold of a *Meſſiah, taking upon himſelf our ſins*, the Evangeliſt applies to *Jeſus, as taking away our bodily diſeaſes:* an interpretation, wholly forein to the meaning of the prophecy; peculiar to *Matthew*; and no where confirmed by any other of the ſacred writers.

Theſe inſtances are ſufficient for the uſe, which I propoſe to make of them.

As to the firſt; the beſt ſolution, which has been given of it, 1
is; “ that either *Matthew*'s memory failed him in the recital of “ it; or that he cited it imperfectly and inaccurately on purpoſe, “ to reprove the Scribes and Phariſees for the ſame looſe and negligent method of interpreting the Scriptures, in which they “ freely indulged themſelves.”

The ſecond, as all the Interpreters agree, is not to be found 2
in any part of the Old Teſtament: and the whole, which is ſaid for it, is, “ that in ſome ſenſe or other, it may be collected “ from ſeveral different expreſſions of different Prophets, joined “ and tacked together; and ſo made to ſuit, by way of *accommo-*

[*a*] Matt. viii. 16, 17.

Erasmus. [*b*] Adduxit hoc teſtimonium Matthæus, nonnihil ad ſuum deflectens negotium. Eraſm. in loc.

[*c*] Matt. xx. 28. xxvi. 28.

[*d*] Heb. ix. 28. Rom. iii. 25. 1 Pet. ii. 24. 1 Joh. ii. 2, &c.

" *dation* [*a*], as Dr. *Hammond* ſays, with ſome particular circum-" ſtance of *Jeſus*'s life.

3 The third was taken, in all probability, from a ſpurious and *apocryphal book*, *of no authority*, falſely aſcribed to the Prophet *Jeremiah*, in which it was read by *St. Jerom*, and never found in any other [*b*].

4 The fourth is manifeſtly ſtrained by *Matthew* to a ſenſe, totally different from that of the Prophet, as it is explaned by all the other ſacred writers.

But as in theſe inſtances, we find *Matthew* accommodating the ſenſe of Prophecies, to an agreement with the facts of his Goſpel, ſo, on the other hand, we find him alſo accommodating his facts, to the ſenſe of the prophecies. For example; He tells us, that *Jeſus*, preparing to make a ſolemn entry into *Jeruſalem*, ordered *two of his Diſciples*, *to go and bring to him an Aſs and a*
The Aſs, and Colt *Colt with her*, which they would find tied together in a certain village: and they went, *as Jeſus commanded them*, *and brought the Aſs and the Colt*, *and put on them their cloaths and ſet him thereon. All this was done*, ſays he, *that it might be fulfilled*, *which was ſpoken by the Prophet*, *ſaying*; *tell ye the daughter of* Sion, *behold thy King cometh unto thee meek*, *ſitting upon an Aſs and a Colt*, *the foal of an Aſs* [*c*]. The Commentators are puzzled here to determine, on which of the two *Jeſus* rode; whether on *the Aſs*, or *the Colt*; while the letter of the text ſeems to declare, that he ſat upon them both; as ſome of the Antients, and of the moderns alſo have interpreted it; who ſolve the ſeeming abſurdity, by ſuppoſing, *that he firſt mounted the one*, *and then the other*: *the Aſs denoting the Jewiſh*, *and the Foal*, *the Gentile Church*; *of both which he was now become the common Head* [*d*]. But all this difficulty

The Aſs, the Jews
The Colt, the Gentiles.

[*a*] Hamm. on Matt. ii. 23.

[*b*] Omittamus earum Scripturarum fabulas, quæ apocryphæ nuncupantur — in his enim etſi invenitur aliqua veritas, tamen propter multa falſa, nulla eſt Canonica Auctoritas. Auguſt. de Civ. D. l. 15. c. 23.

August.

[*c*] Matt. xxi. 5. Zach. ix. 9.

[*d*] Ad quod quæri utri Dominus jumento inſederit, pullone an aſinæ: alii ipſum

culty will vaniſh at once, if we take the account of this ſame fact, as it is given by the other Evangeliſts; who expreſsly ſay; that it was *the Foal or the Colt* onely, which *Jeſus* ſent for and rode upon: which is the moſt probable, as well from the nature of the thing, as from the concurrent teſtimony of three againſt one. But it is remarkable, that as *John* relates the ſame fact differently from *Matthew*, ſo he cites the ſame prophecy alſo as differently: and as, in his Goſpel, he ſpeaks of no more than *the Colt*, ſo in the prophecy he drops the mention of *the Aſs*, and takes no more, than what relates to *the Colt* [a]. Whence it appears, that as *Matthew* adapted his fact to the letter of the prophecy, ſo *John* accommodated the letter of the prophecy to the reality of the fact.

Matthew, adapted the fact to the Prophecy,
John the Prophecy to the Fact.

The late Dr. *Rogers*, treating this very quæſtion, in one of his Sermons, affirms *the inſpiration of the Apoſtles* to be a fundamental point in it: and, upon that hypotheſis, gives two general ſolutions of all the objections, which are made to the application of theſe prophecies in the New Teſtament. 1ſt, " That ſuch applications of them, tho' groundleſs or falſe in themſelves, yet " being ſuch, as were commonly received, and paſſed for current " among the Jews, might properly be urged to them by perſons " inſpired, as arguments ad hominem, upon their own conceſ- " ſions, without any impeachment of their inſpiration. 2dly, " To bring the matter, as he ſays, to a ſhort iſſue, he affirms, " that all ſuch applications muſt neceſſarily be true, becauſe they " were made *by perſons inſpired* [b]." The abſurdity of which reaſoning ſhews, to what contemptible ſhifts the moſt plauſible writers will be reduced, when intangled with the defence of Syſtems, which are contradictory to plain facts.

Rogers
Inspiration fundamental.

Shifts.

---

ipſum utrique, prius uni deinde alteri inſediſſe reſpondent: atque in hac ſententia eſt Auguſtinus de Conſ. Evang. l. 2. c. 66. Alii de pullo duntaxat—& quod hic de utroque dicitur animante, ad Allegoriam tranſmittendum autumant, populi Judaici & populi Gentilis. Zeger. in Matt. v. it. Caſaub. in Matt. v. 7. it. Origen. Edit. Huet. p. 430. E.

[a] Joh. xii. 15.

[b] Rogers Serm. p. 121. & p. 127.

When *Jeſus* opened to the Jews theſe evidences of his miſſion, from their own Prophets, he admoniſhed them *to ſearch the Scriptures*, for the proof and trial of the truth of what he alledged [*a*]. The Apoſtles did the ſame; conſtantly exhorting them, to examine the Old Teſtament, that they might ſee, whether the teſtimonies, to which they appealed, were ſo or not: and the people of *Beræa* are particularly commended, for *ſearching the Scriptures more diligently, than the reſt of the Jewiſh Converts* [*b*]. Now there could be no other meaning in this appeal to the Scriptures, on the one ſide, and this ſearch of them, on the other, but to try, whether the particular teſtimonies, referred to by the Apoſtles, were really to be found in them, and in that very ſenſe, to which they were applied. This is the foundation, on which Chriſt and his Apoſtles put the deciſion of this quæſtion: and it is the ſole foundation, on which the Jews could rationally be convinced and converted to the faith of the Goſpel. To affirm then, as the Doctor above mentioned has done, *that the Inſpiration of the Apoſtles*, is the fundamental point, on which it depends, is in effect, to teach the contrary, to what Chriſt and his Apoſtles had taught; "that we need not trouble ourſelves on this occaſion with ſearching the Scriptures; and that the ſearch of them is fruitleſs; for tho' the paſſages, referred to by the Evangeliſts, ſhould not be found in them, which is the caſe of ſome, or found in a ſenſe quite different from that, to which they are applied, which is the caſe of others, yet we muſt receive them all as infallibly true, becauſe they are delivered by perſons inſpired."

Bereans.

But to ſpeak a word or two to each of his ſolutions. As to the firſt, it is utterly incredible, that perſons inſpired and ſpecially commiſſioned by God, to propagate a particular doctrine, and ſupplied conſequently with proofs the moſt authentic and demonſtrative of it's truth, could on any account be reduced, to make uſe of trifling or equivocal arguments for the ſupport of it; much leſs of ſuch, as are falſe and groundleſs. Yet if this ſhould in any manner be thought probable, in an occaſional conference or debate with private perſons, who had been trained and accuſtomed to that ſort of reaſoning, it is ſurely inconſiſtent with any notion of inſpiration, to publiſh ſuch arguments in writing, to all the world, and to all poſterity, as the ſtanding and perpetual proofs of the Chriſtian doctrine, which they knew in reality to be no proofs at all, except to a few particular Jews, of thoſe very times; and which, inſtead of doing ſervice to religion, could ſerve onely for matter of doubt and cavil to all ſucceding times.

[*a*] Joh. v. 39.

[*b*] Acts xvii. 11.

As to his ſecond ſolution; if we ſhould aſk, how it appears, that the Apoſtles were actually inſpired, in their interpretations of theſe prophecies? it will be anſwered, I ſuppoſe, becauſe they *wrought miracles* [a]. And ſo far indeed I agree, that in the act of working miracles, they were certainly inſpired with an extraordinary power; but when that act was over, and the ſpecial purpoſe of thoſe miracles ſerved, it is reaſonable to believe, from the evidence of thoſe facts, which I have elſewhere ſet forth, that they returned to the condition of fallible men.

Inspired when they wrought Miracles.

Peter wrought many miracles, yet was charged afterwards by *Paul, with acting in contradiction to the truth of the Goſpel* [b]. *Paul* wrought as many, yet in ſome caſes *diſclames any inſpiration* [c]. *Barnabas* alſo wrought miracles, yet *Paul* and he quarrelled ſo far, as to part in great wrath from each other, about *Mark, the Evangeliſt*, whom *Paul* looked upon as a Deſertor; *Barnabas*, as an honeſt man: where one of them, was ſurely miſtaken, and both of them probably to be blamed [d].

Peter, Paul, Barnabas, Mark.

If the Apoſtles indeed had called the Jews together, and wrought a miracle before them, in confirmation of any particular interpretation of Scripture, this reaſoning would be juſt, and the miracle rightly alledged for the truth of ſuch interpretation: but ſince this was not the caſe, the inference is certainly groundleſs, that miracles wrought at one time, prove the workers of them, to have been infallible at all times. Nay the power of working miracles is ſo far from proving thoſe, who are indued with it, to be perpetually inſpired, or ſpecially favored by God, that it does not prove them even to be good or honeſt men: ſince according to the conſtant teſtimony of the moſt eſteemed and orthodox of the Primitive Fathers, it was poſſeſſed ſometimes by *wicked men, and Heretical Chriſtians,* corrupt both in faith and manners [a].

---

[a] Rogers Serm. 128.

[b] Galat. ii. 14.

[c] 1 Cor. vii. 12, 25. 2 Cor. xi. 17. Gal. iii. 15.

[d] Act. xv. 39.

Let us now ſee, what uſe the enemies of Chriſtianity have endeavoured to make of the prophecies applied by the Evangeliſts in the manner above ſpecified; and what anſwer the truth of the caſe will oblige us to give to them. The Author of a *Diſcourſe on the Grounds and Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion,* aſſerts, “that the foundation of it is laid by the Evangeliſts, on the proof “of this point, *that the miſſion and character of Jeſus were fore-“told by the Prophets*; and that the validity of this proof depends “intirely on the force of thoſe particular prophecies which the “ſame Evangeliſts have applied to the illuſtration of it, in their “ſeveral Goſpels [b].” Upon this hypotheſis, he undertakes to ſhew, “that the Prophecies, ſo applied by them, do not at all re-“late to *Jeſus*, in their proper and litteral ſignification, but onely “in a ſecondary, typical and figurative ſenſe: and then by expo-“ſing this way of interpreting them, as equivocal, precarious, “and incapable of yielding any rational conviction, he imagines “that he has done, what he aimed at, and overturned the foun-“dation of the Chriſtian religion.”

Grounds and Reasons.
Collins,

And in truth, if we admit, that Chriſtianity has no other foundation than what he has aſſigned to it, it might not perhaps be difficult for him to make good the reſt: for upon that ſuppoſition, he has thrown many objections in our way, which it is ſcarce poſſible to get clear of. But while he fancied himſelf to be demoliſhing foundations, he was battering onely ſuch parts of the edifice, as ſerve for it's ornament, rather than it's ſupport. He profeſſes to ſhew, that the *Prophecies cited by Matthew*, relate to *Jeſus* onely in a figurative ſenſe; and if he had ſhewn, that ſome of them did not relate to him in any ſenſe at all, he would have done no more, than what ſome of the primitive Fathers, as well as modern Critics had done before him, without deſigning or doing the leaſt hurt to Chriſtianity.

---

[a] Ut intelligamus, quædam miracula etiam Sceleratos homines facere, qualia Sancti facere non poſſunt—

Quapropter aliter Magi faciunt miracula; aliter boni Chriſtiani; aliter mali Chriſtiani. Auguſt. Op. T. 6. p. 71.

Magi, boni, mali
August.

Hoc adverſus Hæreticos, qui probationem fidei ſuæ ex eo, ſi ſignum aliquod fecerint, arbitrantur. Hier. T. 4. p. 252. Vid. it. Chryſoſt. T. 3. p. 64. D. it. T. 7. p. 376. D. Edit. Bened. Chrisost.

[b] See Diſc. on the Grounds and Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion, p. 4, 5. 26, 27. As this is Collins.

Jeſus, as it is ſaid above, declared in general, *that Moſes and the Prophets had teſtified of him:* but ſince the Evangeliſts did not think it neceſſary to give a preciſe account, or deduction of the ſeveral prophecies, which were alledged by him in proof of that declaration; it is ſufficient to take it, juſt as we find it; as being true in general; without thinking ourſelves obliged to defend all the particular inſtances and applications, which were offered afterwards in ſupport of it, by fallible men. It is *Jeſus* onely, who is called *the Truth*; and who alone was incapable of error: but *he ſuffered his Apoſtles*, as *Eraſmus* ſays, *to be drawn ſometimes into miſtakes, by a wrong judgement or affection*, &c. [a]. Theſe then being full of zeal for this new doctrine, taught them in general by their Maſter, yet wanting his unerring ſpirit, may probably be ſuppoſed, from an eagerneſs of explaning and illuſtrating it, to have ſtrained it in ſome caſes farther than it would bear; in the ſame manner, as their Succeſſors continued alſo to do more remarkably in the following ages; who, full of the ſame zeal, yet without the ſame knowledge, ſtretched this argument of prophecy ſtill farther, and diſcovered, as they imagined, many more inſtances of it applicable to *Jeſus*, than ever the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles had dreamt of.

Jesus only, the Truth.

Erasmus

Prophecy Stretched.

---

[a] Paſſus eſt ſuos ignorare quædam & labi, errareque alicubi judicio ſive affectu. in Matth. ii. 6. Erasmus.

1 This

This therefore may ſerve for a general anſwer to all the objections, which are made *to the prophecies of the Old Teſtament, as they are cited and ſaid to be fulfilled in the New:* that we are not obliged to receive all ſuch applications of them, as infallible; that Chriſtianity does not depend upon it; that whoever ſhall attack it on this article, will labor onely in vain, unleſs he can ſhew; that the *miſſion and character of Jeſus* were not, in any manner or ſenſe at all, prefigured in the Old Teſtament, or that *Moſes and the Prophets had no where teſtified of him.* This is the ſingle point, which can affect or hurt the cauſe of Chriſtianity, and all the cavils, which fall ſhort of this, may juſtly be ſlighted, as of no real weight in this quæſtion.

Whiston in Answer to Collins cites 45 Prophecies.

Mr. *Whiſton* in defending *The Litteral Accompliſhment of the Scripture-prophecies,* againſt the Author of *The Grounds and Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion,* has produced *forty five prophecies* from the Old Teſtament, which are all cited in the New, in proof *of the Meſſiahſhip of Jeſus,* and which he declares to have been *clearly and directly fullfilled, without the leaſt pretence of any reply from that Author or any other whatſoever* [a]. Now if any number of theſe, how ſmall ſoever, are found to be as clearly accompliſhed, as he takes them to be, they are ſufficient to ſupport the authority of the Goſpel, tho' all the reſt were thrown aſide.

Jerom

But to ſay the truth, the grounds of our faith, in theſe *later ages of the Church,* do not lie in the particular interpretations of prophecies, made by men, who might be miſtaken, and who, as *Jerom* ſays more than once, *by truſting to their memories, in citing theſe very prophecies, were frequently miſtaken in the words, and ſometimes in the ſenſe of them* [b]. Nor is the evidence of prophecy

---

[a] See The Litteral Accompliſhment of Script. Proph. &c. p. 1.— 19. See alſo The Supplement, &c. p. 1, 2.

Jerom

[b] Sunt autem qui aſſerunt; in omnibus pene teſtimoniis, quæ de Veteri Teſtamento ſumuntur, iſtiuſmodi eſſe errorem, ut aut ordo mutetur aut verba; & interdum ſenſus quoque diverſus ſit: vel Apoſtolis, vel Evangeliſtis non ex libro carpentibus teſtimonia, ſed memoriæ credentibus, quæ nonnunquam fallitur. Hieron. in Mich. c. 5. Op. T. 3. p. 1531.

Hoc

phecy ſo proper, in theſe days, *to convert men to the faith of Chriſt, as to confirm thoſe, who have already embraced it* [a]: Serving chiefly, as St. *Paul* expreſſes it, *not to them, who believed not, but to them, who believe* [b].

Paul

Upon the firſt promulgation of the Goſpel, while the converſion of the Jews was the principal object of our Savior's miniſtry, and afterwards of his Apoſtles, the argument of prophecy was, of all others, the beſt adapted to perſuade and conquer the prejudices of that nation. But in preaching the Goſpel to the Gentiles, not acquainted with the Jewiſh Scriptures, nor tinctured with any Jewiſh prejudices, the teſtimony of it's miracles, and the purity of it's doctrines, were the moſt affecting proofs of it's divine origin. Yet when by the evidence of theſe, people had once received the Chriſtian faith, and acquired a competent knowledge of it, they would then perceive, that the argument of prophecy, was a part alſo of the evidence, eſſentially neceſſary to complete the demonſtration of it's truth. And on this foundation *Grotius* has built the beſt Apology for it, which has ever been publiſhed perhaps ſince the times of the Apoſtles.

Purity.

Grotius

To conclude; the chief purpoſe of theſe inquiries, is, to ſhew, that Chriſtianity cannot be defended to the ſatisfaction of ſpeculative and thinking men, but by reducing it to it's original ſimplicity, and ſtripping it of the falſe gloſſes, and ſyſtems, with which it has been incumbered, through the prejudices of the pious, as well as the arts of the crafty and the intereſted. One of the principal of theſe incumbrances, as far as I am able to judge, is the notion, which is generally inculcated by our Divines, concerning *the perpetual inſpiration and infallibility of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts:* a notion, which has imported ſuch difficulties and

Inspiration and Infallibility, the principal difficulty.

Hoc autem in omnibus pene teſtimoniis, quæ de veteribus libris in novo aſſumta ſunt Teſtamento, obſervare debemus: quod memoriæ crediderint Evangeliſtæ vel Apoſtoli; & tantum ſenſu explicato ſæpe ordinem commutaverint; nonnunquam vel detraxerint verba vel addiderint. Id. in Ep. ad Galat. c. 3. Op. T. 4. p. 253.

[a] Qualia in Prophetis multa, apta non ad convincendos incredulos, ſed ad confirmandos, qui credidere. Grot. Vot. pro pace. p. 104.

[b] 1 Cor. xiv. 22.

perplexities into the ſyſtem of the Chriſtan religion, as all the wit of man has not been able to explane: which yet will all be eaſily ſolved, and vaniſh at once, by admitting onely the contrary notion, *that the Apoſtles were fallible:* which is a ſort of proof that generally paſſes with men of ſenſe for demonſtrative; being of the ſame kind, by which *Sir Iſaac Newton* has convinced the world, of the truth of his philoſophical principles.

The Apostles were fallible.

Newton

For this great Philoſopher, by conſidering the real effects and productions of nature, and applying the cauſes of thoſe, which were within the reach of ſenſe and experiment, to all other phænomena of a ſimilar kind, more diſtant and remote from the ſame trial, arrived at laſt, by a chain of conſequences, at the diſcovery of that univerſal principle, by which the beautifull order of this viſible world is regulated, and all the particular motions and activities of it's conſtituent parts perpetually directed; which in every other hypotheſis, had been perplexed with inſuperable difficulties. *Deſcartes* took the contrary method: he firſt conceived the Idea of his univerſal principle, and by the force of his great wit and comprehenſion, made it correſpond ſo aptly with the principal phænomena of nature, that it was received with great applauſe by the learned. But when it came to be examined afterwards with rigor, and was found irreconcileable to fact and experience, it gradually loſt ground, and is now generally rejected by men of Science.

[illegible]scartes

The caſe is the ſame in Theological, as in natural inquiries: it is experience alone, and the obſervation of facts, which can illuſtrate the truth of principles. Facts are ſtubborn things, deriving their exiſtence from nature, and tho' frequently miſrepreſented and diſguiſed by art and falſe colors, yet cannot be totally changed, or made pliable to the Syſtems, which happen to be in faſhion; but, ſooner or later, will always reduce the opinions of men, to a compliance and conformity with themſelves.

Wherefore, as we learn from dayly experience that prejudice, paſſion, want of memory, knowledge or judgement naturally produce obſcurity, inaccuracy and miſtakes in all modern writings whatſoever; ſo when we ſee the ſame effects in antient writings, how ſacred ſoever they may be deemed, we muſt neceſſarily impute them to the ſame cauſes. This is what ſenſe and reaſon preſcribe, and what will be found at laſt the onely way of ſolving all the difficulties above intimated: whereas our Theoriſts, who come provided with ſyſtems which they impoſe as the Catholic rule, by which the Chriſtian doctrine muſt be explaned, are driven to ſuch miſerable ſhifts and abſurdities, in their attempts to accommodate that rule to the particular facts of the Goſpel, that, inſtead of clearing it of it's difficulties, they never fail to obſcure and perplex it ſtill more, till they render it incompatible with any conſiſtent and rational belief.

AN ESSAY ON THE GIFT of TONGUES.

TENDING

To explane the proper notion and nature of it, as it is deſcribed and delivered to us in the Sacred Scriptures.

AND

As it appears alſo to have been underſtood by the Learned both of the antient and modern times.

AN

ESSAY

ON THE

GIFT of TONGUES.

THE gift of tongues, of which I am now going to treat, was firſt conferred by Chriſt on his Apoſtles, about ten days after his Aſcenſion, in a public and ſolemn aſſembly of all the Diſciples in *Jeruſalem*, on the feaſt of *Pentecoſt*; as the account of it is delivered to us by *St. Luke*, in the following words.

Luke.

Acts ii.

1. *And when the day of Pentecoſt was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.*

Pentecost

2. *And ſuddenly there came a ſound from heaven, as of a ruſhing mighty wind, and it filled all the houſe where they were ſitting.*
3. *And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it ſat upon each of them.*
4. *And they were all filled with the Holy Ghoſt, and began to ſpeak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.*
5. *And there were dwelling at Jeruſalem, Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven.*
6. *Now when this was noiſed abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, becauſe that every man heard them ſpeak in his own language.*
7. *And they were all amazed and marvelled, ſaying one to another, behold, are not all theſe, who ſpeak, Galilæans ?*

8. *And how hear we, every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?*
9. *Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Meſopotamia, and in Judæa, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Aſia,*
10. *Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Ægypt, and in the parts of Lybia, about Cyrene, and ſtrangers of Rome, Jews and Proſelytes,*
11. *Cretes and Arabians; we do hear them ſpeak in our tongues, the wonderful works of God.*
12. *And they were all amazed and were in doubt, ſaying one to another, what meaneth this?*
13. *Others mocking, ſaid, theſe men are full of new wine.*

From this narrative of the original collation of this miraculous gift of tongues, we find it to have been tranſacted in the ſame manner, which God is ſaid to have uſed on other occaſions, whenever he thought fit to ſtrike the minds of men with an awful ſenſe of his immediate preſence. That is, by ſome extraordinary noiſe, as *of a wind violently ruſhing*, and ſhaking the place, and the appearance alſo of fire or flame ſuddenly flaſhing, to the amazement of thoſe, who beheld it. "The manner of exhibiting this gift, ſays Dr. *Lightfoot*, was in *tongues of fire*, that "the giving of the Holy Ghoſt, at the initiating of the Chriſtian Church, might anſwer the giving of the Law, at the initiating of the Jewiſh: and ſo it did, both in time and manner; that being given at *the feaſt of Pentecoſt*, and in an appearance of fire, and ſo likewiſe this." But what is peculiar to the caſe before us, is, that this fire is ſaid to have aſſumed the ſhape *of cloven tongues*, and to have ſitten for ſome time in that form, on the heads of the Apoſtles. Hence we ſee, how the Painters, in all their deſcriptions of this ſtory, have fixed upon the head of each Apoſtle, *a flame of fire*, ſplit and divided into ſome reſemblance of a cloven tongue. Yet that, which is mentioned in the text to have ſitten upon each of them, is interpreted by ſome Critics, to relate, not, as it is commonly underſtood, to *the figure of a*

Rushing Wind
Flashing Flame

The Initiation of the Church like that of the Law.

cloven tongue, which appeared like to fire, but to the Spirit itſelf, with which they were then inſpired, and which accordingly ſat, or reſided upon them for ſome time [a]. And this indeed ſeems very probable: for tho' the paſſage itſelf may appear at the firſt ſight to carry a different ſenſe, yet by conſidering all it's circumſtances, we cannot reaſonably collect any thing more from it, than that a fire from heaven flaſhed ſuddenly into the room, and filled it with an extraordinary light, which, like all other Phænomena of that ſort, no ſooner appeared, than vaniſhed. For when, upon the rumor of this miracle, all the ſeveral nations, who dwelt at *Jeruſalem*, flocked in crouds to the place, to inform themſelves of the truth of it; if the forms of *cloven tongues* had continued to ſit on the heads of the Apoſtles, that would have been the firſt thing, which muſt have ſtruck them with wonder and ſurprize: but it is evident from the text, that the multitude ſaw no appearance of that kind: for tho' they are ſaid to have been greatly amazed, it was not, at what they ſaw, but what they heard; *viz. a number of illiterate men, born in the midſt of* Galilee, *addreſſing themſelves freely to each different nation, in it's own proper language.*

A Fire flashed in the room.

The ſame inference may be drawn alſo from the effect, which this miracle had upon the natives of *Jeruſalem*; who, not underſtanding the ſtrange languages, which the Apoſtles were ſeverally ſpeaking, imagined them preſently to be drunk, and utter-

Natives of Jerusalem

---

[a] And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire: and it ſat upon each of them; v. 3. which is thus interpreted by an eminent Critic, *Laurentius Valla*, in his Comment on the place. "They are miſtaken, ſays he, who take "the fire to have reſted on the heads of "the Apoſtles, when it is ſpoken of *the* "*Spirit*, which ſat upon them. Their "tongues alſo are ſaid to have been cloven and fiery, as it were, to denote "that variety of languages, with which "they were indued; not that any *fiery* "*tongues* really ſat on their heads, as "ſome will have it. [Vid. eund. ad loc.] *St. Jerom* alſo ſeems to allude to the ſame interpretation: "They were baptized, "ſays he, ſo effectually by the Holy "Ghoſt, that the whole room was filled, "in which they were ſitting, and the fire "of the Spirit found it's wiſhed for reſidence in them, and divided their "tongues." Op. T. 4. par. 1. p. 178. Edit. Bened.

Valla

Jerom

ing ſome ſenſeleſs jargon of their own, which wine onely had inſpired; a notion; which they could not eaſily have entertained, if they had ſeen this cœleſtial fire ſitting at the ſame time on their heads: ſince ſo conſpicuous a prodigy muſt needs have ſuggeſted a different reflection, and obliged them to acknowledge the finger of God in it. We cannot however think it ſtrange, that fire flaſhing from heaven, and ſuddenly vaniſhing, ſhould yield ſome reſemblance *of tongues* to the eyes of the multitude: for this is no more, than what is natural, and what we may obſerve, in ſome meaſure, from every flame, that flaſhes from the clouds; and breaks itſelf of courſe, into a number of ſmall and pointed particles, not remote from that ſhape. Hence, in the *Hebrew* language, we find the *flame, or fire, that devoureth the ſtubble,* called by *Iſaiah, the tongue of fire.* Where the Critics obſerve, *that a flame is ſo called by the Prophet, on the account of it's likeneſs to a tongue, both in it's color and ſhape; as being red, and tending towards a point* [a]. So that the *cloven tongues* in the text, are to be conſidered as a mere *Hebraiſm,* not properly tranſlated, which ſignifies nothing more, than *a flame of fire burſt into the room, whoſe broken and divided particles flaſhed over the heads of the Apoſtles, in the form, as it were, of fiery tongues* [b]. But from all the circumſtances already mentioned, it ſeems reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the fire itſelf, as ſoon as it had illuminated the room, in ſuch a manner, as to indicate ſomething miraculous and ſupernatural in it, immediately vaniſhed, as well as *the ruſhing wind,* with which it was accompanied.

Hebraism.

As to the nature of the gift, which was conferred in this extraordinary manner, it was a faculty of ſpeaking *new and ſtrange languages,* infuſed inſtantaneouſly by God into the Apoſtles, in order to convince all thoſe different nations, then reſiding in *Jeruſalem,* that they were authoriſed and commiſſioned by a divine power, to preach the Goſpel of *Jeſus*. But tho' they were all equally indued with the ſame faculty, and are all ſaid to have given proofs of it in this ſame aſſembly; we are not to imagine, that they all ſpoke together, or at the ſame time; for that could onely create confuſion: but that one or two of them perhaps addreſſed themſelves by turns, to different parts of the company, and expounded to each in their own tongue, *the wonderful works of God:* according to that rule, preſcribed afterwards by *St. Paul*, for the exerciſe of this very gift in all public aſſemblies, that thoſe, who poſſeſſed it, *ſhould ſpeak ſingly, and in their proper courſe, one after another* [a].

---

[a] לשון אש—Sicut ſtipulam devorat *lingua ignis.* [Vulg. Iſa. v. 24.] i. e. Flamma: quod ea linguæ ſpeciem præ ſe fert: nam rubet, & in acutiem tendit. Vatab. in locum.

[b] Διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρός. Acts ii. 3. Vid. Heinſii Exercit. ad loc.

Paul

St. Paul, who, as he himſelf tells us, was indued with this gift in it's fulleſt meaſure, and the beſt acquainted therefore with it's true value, ranks it in the loweſt claſs of ſpiritual gifts; and as a thing of little or no worth; beſtowed ſometimes on perſons, who do not ſeem to have underſtood the very languages, which they ſpoke, but wanted *an interpreter*, to explane their own words to them: and he cenſures that zeal, which the Chriſtians of thoſe days expreſſed for it, as a *childiſh affection*, which prompted them to prefer, what was ſtrange, and ſurprizing, to what was uſeful and edifying [b].

Paul.
lowest class

But the principal end and proper uſe of this gift, was to ſerve, on ſome ſolemn occaſions, as a *ſenſible proof and illuſtrious ſign*, that a divine influence reſted on thoſe, who were indued with it. Thus our Saviour, when he gave the firſt promiſe of it to his diſciples, ſays; *theſe ſigns ſhall accompany thoſe, who believe — they ſhall ſpeak with new tongues*, &c. [c]. And *St. Paul* declares, that *tongues were given for a ſign, not to thoſe, who believe, but to thoſe, who believe not* [d]. Which ſign, as ſoon as it had ſerved

Speak with new Tongues

---

[a] 1 Cor. xiv. 27.

[b] He, that ſpeaketh in a ſtrange tongue, ſpeaketh not unto men, but unto God: for no man underſtandeth him.—Wherefore let him, who ſpeaketh in a ſtrange tongue, pray, that he may interpret.—ibid. v. 2, 13, 14, &c.—it. c. xii. 10, 28.

Paul

[c] Mar. xvi. 17.

[d] 1 Cor. xiv. 22.

that particular purpoſe, for which it was given, ſeems to have ceaſed and totally vaniſhed.

There are two or three other paſſages in the *Acts*, which have ſome relation to this, which I am now conſidering: for when the diſciples in *Jeruſalem* were aſſembled together with *Peter* and *John*, and praying earneſtly to God, to grant them courage *to preach the word with boldneſs, and to perform ſigns and wonders in the name of Jeſus*, we read; that their prayer was no ſooner finiſhed, *than the place was ſhaken, in which they were aſſembled*; as a divine ſignal, and ſure token, that their prayer was accepted. Thus alſo when *Paul* and *Silas were praying to God in priſon, there was ſuddenly a great earthquake, ſo that the foundations of the priſon were ſhaken and it's doors opened, and every one's bands were looſed* [a]. We may learn likewiſe from the Old Teſtament, that it was uſual with God, even under the Jewiſh diſpenſation, to employ theſe extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, as *pledges* or *ſigns*, either to inſure the performance of ſome promiſe, or to demonſtrate the collation of ſome benefit.—Thus *Samuel*, when he anointed *Saul* to be King over *Iſrael*, informs him of *three ſigns*, which would be given to him, as a proof, that the Kingdom was deſtined to him by God: the third of which is, *that the Spirit of the Lord would come upon him, and he ſhould propheſy, and be turned into another man*: and *when theſe ſigns*, ſays he, *ſhall come upon thee, then do, as occaſion ſhall ſerve thee, for God is with thee* [b]. Thus alſo, when *Moſes* choſe *ſeventy Elders* out of the people, to aſſiſt him in the adminiſtration of the government, *God transferred his ſpirit from* Moſes *unto thoſe ſeventy*, as *a ſign* or

ſhaken

Earthquake

Pledges ſigns.

3 ſigns.

Spirit ſhould come upon him

70 Elders.

---

[a] Acts iv. 31. xvi. 26.

Grotius here obſerves, *that theſe extraordinary movements were given, as ſigns of God's powerful interpoſition, and of ſome great thing to follow.* [Vid. eund ad Loc.] And *Wolfius* alſo remarks, how the Gentiles were poſſeſſed with the ſame notion, that the preſence of God was uſually ſignified by *ſome vehement motion or concuſſion of the air and earth.* [Vid. Comm. ad loc.]

Conſtat Aventinæ tremuiſſe cacumina Sylvæ,
Terraque ſubſedit, pondere preſſa Jovis.

The earth ſhook, ſays the Pſalmiſt, *the heavens alſo dropped at the preſence of God, even* Sinai *itſelf was moved at the preſence of God, the God of* Iſrael.

[b] 1 Sam. x. 2, 8.

Wolfius. Gentiles

Preſence of God ſignified by concuſsions of air and Earth.

Aventin

Sinai

token, both to them and to the people, that they were ſelected to this office by divine appointment: and it *came to paſs, that while the Spirit reſted upon them, they propheſied and did not ceaſe* [a]. Hence flow thoſe expreſſions, which we often meet with in *St. Paul*, of *the ſeal, the earneſt, the witneſs of the Spirit*, given in the hearts of the believers [b]; as a ſure pledge of God's peculiar favor. For *as the ſeal of a ring*, ſays *Grotius*, *impreſſed on a bond, renders the whole firm and unqueſtionable, ſo the ſeal of God's ſpirit impreſſed on mens hearts, leaves no room to doubt of his paternal love of them* [c].

Spirit rested upon them
Seal, Earnest Witness.
Grotius.
Seal on the Heart. Law written on the heart.

I find but two other paſſages in the New Teſtament, where we have any particular account of the collation of this *gift of tongues*; which, in both of them, appears to have been conferred for no other purpoſe, than what I have already intimated, to ſignify to the company then aſſembled, the immediate preſence and interpoſition of the Deity. For example; in the firſt of them, we read, that when *St. Peter*, by the command of God, had inſtructed *Cornelius* and his family, in the grounds of the Chriſtian faith, *the Holy Ghoſt fell upon all, who heard him, and they ſpake with tongues.* But of what ſervice could a *variety of languages* poſſibly be, among a few perſons of the ſame family and probably of the ſame tongue, unleſs it were, to give a freſh proof to *Peter*, by this effect of his miniſtry, how powerfully he was ſupported by the divine aſſiſtance; and to ſhew the Gentile proſelytes, that they were now admitted to a participation of the ſame privileges with the Jews, and to convince the Jewiſh converts at the ſame time, who accompanied *Peter* from *Joppa*, of their errors and prejudices, with regard to their antient rites; and that theſe extraordinary favors of heaven, were no longer limited to the circumciſed onely, or to the ſeed of *Abraham*, but were now laid open and imparted in common to all nations: for, as the text informs us, *they of the circumciſion, who believed, were*

Holy Ghost fell upon all. They spake with Tongues.

---

[a] Numb. xi. 25.

[b] 2 Cor. i. 22. v. 5. Eph. i. 13, 14. Rom. viii. 16.

[c] Vid. Grot. in Epheſ. i. 13.

aſtoniſhed,

The Gentile's ſpake with Tongues.

aſtoniſhed, as many as came with Peter, *becauſe, that on the Gentiles alſo was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghoſt, for they heard them ſpeak with tongues, and magnify God* [a].

Disciples at Ephesus, baptised by John, never heard of any Holy Ghost.

Holy Ghost came upon them and they ſpake with Tongues.

In the other paſſage, we are told, " how *St. Paul* happened " to meet with certain Diſciples at *Epheſus*, who had not re- " ceived any other baptiſm, but that of *John*, nor ever heard of " *any Holy Ghoſt*; whereupon he baptized them in the name of " *Jeſus*; and having laid his hands upon them, *the Holy Ghoſt* " *came on them and they ſpake with tongues* [b]." Now theſe were but *twelve* in number, all probably of the ſame country and language, as well as of the ſame faith: ſo that the gift of tongues could not be of any other benefit on this occaſion, than to give a teſtimony to *St. Paul*, as well as to the men themſelves, that the act, which they had been performing, was well pleaſing to God.

Austin

Chryſostom.

Perſians, Indians Scythians

St. Auſtin ſays, " that when Chriſt, after his Aſcenſion, ſent " down the Holy Spirit, which he had promiſed; *the moſt emi-* " *nent and neceſſary ſign* of his actual deſcent upon the Diſciples " was, that *every one of them ſhould ſpeak in the tongues of all na-* " *tions* [c]." *St. Chryſoſtom* alſo taking occaſion to inquire into the meaning of *the kinds, or diverſities of tongues*, which are mentioned ſo often by *St. Paul*, interprets it in the ſame manner and to the ſame ſenſe. " Antiently, ſays he, every one, who believed " and was baptized, ſpoke preſently with divers tongues, for the " ſake of manifeſting the Spirit within him. For as the men of " thoſe days were infirm in the faith, and the ſpiritual gifts not " diſcernible to the eyes of the fleſh, ſo a ſenſible gift was be- " ſtowed upon them, that the ſpiritual might be made manifeſt: " wherefore he, who was baptiſed, was inabled to ſpeak, not " onely in our tongue, but in that of *the Perſians*; in that of the " *Indians*; and in that of the *Scythians*; to the intent, that the

---

[a] Acts x. 45, 46.

[b] Ibid. xix. 6.

[c] Cujus venientis in eos, qui crediderant, tunc ſignum erat maximum & maxime neceſſarium, ut unuſquiſque eorum linguis ominum gentium loqueretur. De Civ. D. l. 18. c. 50.

" unbelievers might learn, that he was indued with the Holy " Ghoſt. This was a *ſenſible ſign*, as it was heard by their bo- " dily ears: and this *ſenſible ſign* made the inviſible grace of the " Spirit evident to all: and this *ſign* was called, *the kinds of* " *tongues* [a]."

Hence the learned *Dodwell* declares, " that the Holy Ghoſt " was generally beſtowed on the new converts, at the time of " their baptiſm, by ſome viſible and external ſign, called the *ma-* " *nifeſtation of the Spirit*; by which the unbelievers themſelves were " aſſured beyond all doubt of the reality of the gift." In the number of which external ſigns, he reckons *a lambent flame*, and *the gift of tongues* [b]. But according to Dr. *Lightfoot*, theſe ſpiritual gifts or ſigns were not beſtowed on all promiſcuouſly, who were baptized, but on a certain number onely, whom the Apoſtles were directed by the Holy Ghoſt to lay their hands upon, and whom God had appointed to be Preachers.

Dodwell
Lambent flame
Lightfoot

It is evident then, from the facts and teſtimonies already alledged, that the chief, or ſole end rather of this *gift of tongues*, was, to ſerve as a *ſenſible ſign* in that infirm ſtate of the firſt Chriſtians, that thoſe, to whom it was vouchſafed, were under a divine influence, and acting by a divine commiſſion. And this indeed may be collected from the account, recited above, of the firſt communication of it to the Apoſtles. For in ſuch an aſſembly, as is there deſcribed, compoſed of ſeveral different nations, it is not reaſonable to think, that this *diverſity of tongues* was given to the Apoſtles, for the ſake of converting thoſe nations, by the mere force of ſuch diſcourſes, as they were inabled to make to each in their own tongue: for that would have required more time, than the nature of ſuch a meeting could allow; nor could any ſpeeches of that ſort, made ſucceſſively to different parts of the company, in different languages, be proper to perſuade the whole, but to confound rather and perplex them. For if we ſuppoſe the Apoſtles, to have made each a ſeparate diſcourſe; to the *Parthians* for inſtance, in the *Parthian*; to the *Ægyptians*, in the *Ægyptian*; or to the *Romans*, in the *Latin* tongue; it is certain, that the greateſt part of the Aſſembly, who did not underſtand thoſe languages, would remain all that while amazed, and unedified; and this gift of tongues, if it had not been accompanied by ſome other power more perſuaſive and efficacious, would have expoſed the poſſeſſors of it to ridicule onely and contempt; agreeably to what *St. Paul* declares to the *Corinthians*; *if the whole Church be come together into one place, and all ſpeak with tongues, and there come in thoſe, who are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not ſay, that ye are mad* [a]?

---

[a] Vid. Chryſoſt. Oper. Tom. 3. p. 76. Edit. Benedict.

[b] Spiritus ita baptizatis ut plurimum collatus erat, ut externo aliquo ſigno ſe manifeſtarit: quam Spiritus Φανερωσιν, appellabant—ita ut de Spiritus dono ne quid ipſi dubitare poſſint infideles. — Diſſert. in Iren. 2. p. 205.

In hoc ſignorum numero, ignis lambens. ib. p. 106.

Ad Spiritus Φανερωσιν pertinuiſſe donum illud linguarum, fidemque eo argumento factam apud illos, qui non ante credidiſſent. Ib. p. 110.

Paul

Now all this is actually verified by the ſtory before us; in which we find, that, as long as the Apoſtles were diſplaying this miraculous faculty, the greateſt part of the company, who heard them by turns, ſpeaking in their own languages, were ſtruck with amazement, to perceive a ſet of rude *Galilæans*, ſo learned and accompliſhed of a ſudden, with all this variety of ſtrange tongues; and *they were all in doubt, and aſked one another, what could be the meaning of it:* while the reſt, who underſtood nothing of any of thoſe tongues, took all, which the Apoſtles were uttering, for the mere effect of drunkenneſs; till *Peter* obſerving, that their new gift had wrought it's proper effect, by imprinting a general perſuaſion of ſomething very wonderful in it, and raiſing an impatience in the company to expect the event, roſe up, and putting an end to all that diverſity and diſſonance of languages, began to explane to them, in an affecting and continued diſcourſe, and in a tongue, which they all underſtood, how "what they had juſt "ſeen and heard, was not the effect of wine and drunkenneſs,

Peter

---

[a] 1 Cor. xiv. 23.

“ but of the wiſe counſil and power of God, who had now fulfilled the antient prædictions of his holy Prophets, concerning the character of the Meſſiah, and the nature of his kingdom; which were all verified by the death, the reſurrection and the aſcenſion of that ſame *Jeſus*, whom they had crucified [*a*].” By the power of which ſpeech, he added about *three thouſand* 3000 *ſouls* at once to the number of the faithfull; and exemplified the truth of what *St. Paul* has alſo teſtified, that it is better, *to ſpeak* Paul *five words in the Church with underſtanding, ſo as to inſtruct others by them, than ten thouſand in an unknown tongue* [*b*].

This account of *the gift of tongues*, drawn from the clear teſtimonies of Scripture, plainly ſhews; that it was not of a ſtable or permanent nature, but adapted to peculiar occaſions, and then withdrawn again, as ſoon as it had ſerved the particular purpoſe, for which it was beſtowed. And hence we ſee the vanity of that notion, which is generally entertained about it, that from the firſt communication of it to the Apoſtles, it adhered to them conſtantly as long as they lived, ſo as to inable them to preach the Goſpel to every nation, through which they travelled, in it's own proper tongue. A notion, for which I cannot find the leaſt ground in any part of ſacred writ, but many ſolid reaſons to evince the contrary. Agreeably to which the learned *Salma-* ſalmaſius. *ſius*, ſpeaking of this ſame miracle, ſays, “ we are not to infer from it, that the Apoſtles, by receiving the gift of tongues, received a faculty of ſpeaking all the ſeveral languages, which are commonly uſed in the world. For it is not probable, that the effect of it continued beyond that very day, or any longer, than *the cloven tongues* appeared to ſit upon their heads: when thoſe vaniſhed the miracle ceaſed, and left them deſtitute of every other language, but that of their native country: for he thinks it certain, that they were not acquainted with any other, except what they might afterwards imperfectly acquire

---

[*a*] Act. ii. 14,— 41.

[*b*] 1 Cor. xiv. 19.

" by natural means, as they found occaſion for it [a]." This, tho' it be but little underſtood, and will not perhaps be well reliſhed by the preſent pretenders to orthodoxy, is certainly the moſt probable account of the matter; which I ſhall now endeavour to illuſtrate, as briefly and clearly as I am able, through the remaining part of this Eſſay.

If the language, which the Apoſtles made uſe of in propagating the Goſpel by preaching or writing, had been inſpired into them by God, we ſhould expect ſurely to find it ſuch, as is worthy of God; pure, clear, noble and affecting, even beyond the force of common ſpeech. *What man*, ſays *Cicero*, *is more flowing in his diction than Plato? Jupiter himſelf, the Philoſophers ſay, if he ſpeaks Greek, talks in the ſame manner* [b]. As they had no idea of any thing more excellent, ſo they imagined, that God himſelf would uſe the *Platonic* ſtile; ſince nothing can come from him, but what is the moſt perfect in it's kind: and this indeed is the univerſal ſenſe of mankind, and the ſole rule, which nature has given us, to diſtinguiſh the genuin productions of the Deity.

Jupiter would ſpeak the ſtyle of Plato.

But if we try the Apoſtolic language by this rule, we ſhall be ſo far from aſcribing it to God, as to think it ſcarce worthy of man; I mean, of the liberal and the polite: for we ſhall find it in fact to be utterly rude and barbarous, and abounding with every fault, which can poſſibly deform a language. " If any " one contends, ſays *Eraſmus*, that the Apoſtles were inſpired by " God with the knowledge of all tongues, and that this gift was " perpetual in them; ſince every thing, which is performed by

Apoſtolic Language rude and barbarous.

Erasmus

---

[a] Nec dicendum eſt ex eo miraculo—donum linguarum ita accepiſſe Apoſtolos, ut deinceps omnia loquelarum genera — calluerint & uſurparint. Non enim veriſimile eſt ultra illum diem duraſſe vim illam, quam Spiritus Sanctus iis efflavit, tantiſper locum habituram, quamdiu linguæ igneæ ſupra caput cujuſque inſediſſe dicuntur. — Pro vero ſane tenendum eſt, omnes fere Chriſti diſcipulos & Apoſtolos—non aliam noviſſe linguam præter vernaculam, &c. Vid. Cl. Salmaſ. de Helleniſtica. p. 252, 253, 254.

[b] Quis uberior in dicendo Platone? Jovem quidem, aiunt Philoſophi, ſi Græce loquatur, ſic loqui. Cic. in Brut. p. 219. Edit. Lambin.

Non Ultra illum diem quamdiu lingua ignea ſupra caput

" a divine power, is more perfect, according to *St. Chryſoſtom*, " than what is performed either in the ordinary courſe of nature, " or by the pains of man, how comes it to paſs, that the lan- " guage of the Apoſtles is not onely rough and unpoliſhed, but " imperfect alſo and confuſed, and ſometimes even plainly ſolæ- " ciſing or abſurd? for we cannot poſſibly deny, what the fact " itſelf declares to be true [a]."

rough, unpolished, imperfect
confused, Solæcising, absurd,

It would be tedious, to enumerate all the particular imperfections which are charged to the ſacred ſtile: whole books are written on the ſubject, and filled with the *barbariſms of the New Teſtament:* and tho' ſome writers alſo, on the other hand, prompted by a falſe zeal, have attempted to defend the *purity of ſcriptural Greek*, yet all, which they have been able to ſhew, is, that certain particular words and expreſſions, are uſed there in the ſame ſenſe and with the ſame propriety, with which they are employed by the Claſſic writers: which is nothing more, than what is natural and neceſſary in all human compoſitions; that many words, even of the moſt elegant kind, ſhould be uſed in common, both by the worſt and the beſt authors, who write in the ſame language. But it will be impoſſible to prove, that the order and conſtruction of thoſe words, and the general turn of the periods, which conſtitute, what we call the ſtile, is not truly barbarous and corrupt, and wholly remote from the eaſe and ſweetneſs of the Claſſical compoſitions. Tho' " the whole diction of the " New Teſtament, ſays *Heinſius*, may juſtly be called *Hebraiſti-* " *cal*; yet we now and then meet with a Greek expreſſion, of " which the beſt Greek writers would not be aſhamed [b]."

Barbarisms of the N. Testament

Order, construction of Words
and turn of Periods, barbarous

Heinsius

It is ſomewhat curious to obſerve, that there was a controverſy of the ſame kind among the antient Heathens, concerning the ſtile and compoſition of the *Delphic oracles*. For as thoſe Oracles were delivered in verſe, and the verſes generally rude and harſh, and offending frequently, both in the exactneſs of meter and propriety of language, ſo men of ſenſe eaſily ſaw, *that they*

Oracles.

---

[a] Vid. Eraſm. Annotat. in Act. x. 38.

[b] Exercitat. in Nov. Teſtament.

could not be inſpired by the Deity: others on the contrary, blinded by their prejudices, or urged by their zeal, to ſupport the credit of the popular ſuperſtition, conſtantly maintained, that the verſes were really beautifull, and noble, and worthy of God; and that the contrary opinion flowed from a falſe delicacy and ſickly taſt, which reliſhed no poetry, but what was ſoft and ſweet; and breathing nothing as it were but ſpices and perfumes.. The diſpute however ſeems to have been compounded, and a diſtinction found, in which all parties acquieſced, by allowing ſome *ſort of inſpiration, and divine authority to the matter of the Oracle,* but leaving all the reſt, *to the proper talents and faculties of the Propheteſs* [*a*]: who being tired at laſt, with the continual labor of verſifying, began to utter her Oracles in proſe, till the whole impoſture fell by degrees into an univerſal contempt, and ſo finally expired [*b*].

We ſee the ſame prejudices ſtill operating in the true, as they did of old in thoſe falſe religions; and find many, who, not content with the allowed divinity of the Chriſtian doctrine, muſt needs have the language alſo, in which it is delivered, acknowledged as divine. But as men of this turn, prepoſſeſſed with ſyſtems, and ſtiff in opinions, are apt to truſt to any thing rather than their ſenſes; and to be moved by authorities rather than by facts; I ſhall offer a few teſtimonies from ſome of the principal of the Antient Fathers, as well as of the modern Critics, to confirm the truth of what I am here aſſerting.

As for the Antients, whatever ſort of inſpiration they aſcribed to the Apoſtles, they all allowed their language to have been intirely their own, and ſuch, as we naturally expect from ignorant men, in the loweſt ſtate of life.

Justin

Juſtin Martyr tells us, " that there went out of *Jeruſalem,* to
" preach the Goſpel to the world, twelve men onely, and thoſe

---

[*a*] Vid. Plutar. De Pythia. Oper. T. 2. p. 396, &c. Edit. Par.

[*b*] Sed cur iſto modo jam Oracula Delphis non eduntur, non modo noſtra ætate, ſed jamdiu, jam ut nihil poſſit eſſe contemptius? Cic. De Div. l. 2.

“ wholly illiterate, and without any ſkill or knowledge of languages [a].”

12 Men wholly illiterate without Skill or Knowledge of Languages.

“ The Apoſtles, ſays *Origen*, who were not ignorant, in what part they were infirm and deficient, declare themſelves to be *Idiots in ſpeech*, but not in knowledge [b].—For if the Scripture, ſays he, had been written with that elegance and politeneſs of ſtile, which was admired by the Greeks, it might have been ſuſpected, that it's ſucceſs was not owing to the force of truth, but that men had been caught and charmed by the flowing eaſe and beauty of the language.”

Origen

Idiots in Speech.

Euſebius ſays, “ that the Apoſtles, tho' perfectly pure in their lives, and adorned with every virtue, were yet *rude and barbarous* in ſpeech, and truſting to the miraculous powers imparted to them by our Saviour, neither underſtood nor attempted to recommend the doctrines of their Maſter by any art or ornaments of language [c].”

Eusebius

rude and barbarous in Speech.

St. Chryſoſtom, explaning the wonderful work of God, in converting the Gentile world, adds; “ but by whom did he convert them? by eleven men, illiterate, idiots, ineloquent, poor—without any force of words or rhetoric, or Science, to recommend them; but Fiſhermen and Tent-makers, and of a ſtrange language. For they did not ſpeak the ſame tongue with thoſe, whom they perſuaded, but a foreign one, and different from all others, I mean the *Hebrew* [d].”

Chryſostom

illiterat, Ideots, ineloquent.

St. Jerom ſays, “ that they were indued with a power of working divers ſorts of miracles, leſt no body ſhould otherwiſe believe a ſet of ruſtic, unlearned and ignorant men; wanting every ornament of ſpeech, to enforce their promiſes of the kingdom of heaven [e].”

Jerom

rustic, unlearned ignorant: wanting every Ornament of Speech.

---

[a] Apolog. 1. p. 59. Edit. Thirlb. 1722.

[b] Comment. in Johan. p. 85, 86. Edit. Huet. & Philocal. c. 4.

[c] Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 3. c. 24. p. 116. Edit. Cantab.

[d] Oper. Tom. 1. p. 575, 576. Edit. Bened.

[e] Oper. Tom. 4. p. 35. Ed. Bened.

Austin
ignoble, ignorant illiterate

St. Auſtin alſo obſerves, “that Chriſt choſe for his Apoſtles, “men of mean birth, ignoble, ignorant and illiterate— and that “the divinity of their doctrine diſplayed itſelf the more illuſtriouſly, in convincing the world by ſuch contemptible witneſſes; whoſe eloquence and perſuaſive powers lay in their wonderfull works, not in their words [*a*].”

The modern Critics likewiſe and Interpreters generally affirm the ſame thing; not merely upon the authority of thoſe Antients, but from facts and inſtances, obſerved and collected by themſelves from the Apoſtolic writings [*b*].

Erasmus

not learned from Demosthenes.
but the vulgar.

Eraſmus tells us, “that when the Apoſtles write in Greek, “they borrow much from their own Hebrew; as at this day, “men of little learning, when they talk Latin, always mix ſomewhat with it of their native tongue. For they did not learn “their Greek from the orations of *Demoſthenes*, but from their “converſation with the vulgar, ſo it ſeemed good to the divine “wiſdom, to uſe no help of human eloquence, towards drawing “the world into his religion: nor was *the gift of tongues deſigned* “*to be perpetual:* it was ſufficient, that it was beſtowed, as oft “as occaſion required [*c*].”

Hellenistic, impure

Latinisms, Hebraisms, Syriasms, Macedonicisms. Alexandrion Latin, barbarous, Hebrew and Syriac.

Druſius and *Heinſius*, in their controverſy with *Salmaſius*, about the *Helleniſtic Dialect* of the New Teſtament, declare it to be *barbarous and impure, conſiſting indeed of Greek words, but full of Syriaſms, and Hebraiſms* [*d*]. *Salmaſius* on the other hand, tho' he allows no ſuch dialect, as that, which they call *Helleniſtic*, yet gives the ſame character of the ſtile of the ſacred books, “that it was a “ſort of Greek, compounded of various barbariſms; of *Latiniſms*, *Hebraiſms*, *Syriaſms*, *and Macedoniciſms*; had many words in it, “that were not Greek, many *Alexandrian* and *Latin*, more ſtill

---

[*a*] Oper. Tom. 7. p. 659.

[*b*] Atque hanc de Apoſtolorum ſermone opinionem ipſa res nobis perſuadet, etiamſi non ſuffragaretur ſummorum virorum auctoritas. Eraſm. in Act. x. 38.

[*c*] Eraſm. Ibid.

[*d*] Vid. Funus Ling. Helleniſt. p. 11, 12.

“ merely barbarous, *and numberleſs phraſes from the Hebrew and* “ *the Syriac* [a].”

Theſe teſtimonies ſhew, what was the ſenſe both of the antients and the moderns, concerning the general language of the New Teſtament; I ſhall procede therefore to open briefly in the next place, what has been obſerved and declared alſo by them, concerning the particular ſtile and ſkill in languages of each ſingle Apoſtle or writer of thoſe ſacred books.

St. Matthew is ſaid to have publiſhed his Goſpel the firſt of Mathew in Hebrew. them, and in *the Hebrew tongue*, for the proper benefit of his countrymen [b]. But we may probably ſuppoſe, that the reaſon of his chuſing to write in that language, was his ignorance, or imperfect knowledge of the Greek. For the Greek tongue being then the common language of *Aſia*, and even of *Judæa* itſelf, while the *Hebrew* was confined in a manner to the walls of *Jeruſalem*, an Hiſtory, compiled in *Hebrew*, could be of no great ſervice, in ſpreading the light of the Goſpel, till it was tranſlated into ſome other tongue of more general uſe. This therefore was the real caſe of this *Hebrew* Goſpel; which was ſcarce ſooner publiſhed, than tranſlated into Greek by an unknown hand, and Greek Tranlator unknown. the *Hebrew* copy thrown aſide, and within a few ages after quite loſt [c].

St. Mark, tho' diſtinguiſhed by a *Roman* name, was yet a Jew; Mark a Jew. and according to *Grotius*, *was better acquainted with the Hebrew,* Grotius *than the Greek, in which he wrote, yet moderately ſkilled in them both, as his diction plainly ſhews* [d].

---

[a] Vid. Funus Ling. Helleniſt. p. 42. *N. B.* Thoſe, who would ſee this point more fully treated, may conſult *Father Simon*'s Critical Hiſtory of the New Teſtament, where he will find many more authorities collected on the ſame ſubject. Simon

[b] Primus omnium Matthæus eſt Publicanus— qui Evangelium in Judæa Hebræo ſermone edidit; ob eorum vel maxime cauſam, qui in Jeſum crediderant ex Jerom Judæis. Hieron. Op. T. 4. p. 3.

[c] Quod quis poſtea in Græcum tranſ- Jerom tulerit, non ſatis certum eſt. Ibid. par. 2. p. 102.

[d] Judæum fuiſſe, & ἑβραΐζοντα magis Grotius quam ἑλληνίζοντα, quanquam ſermonis utriuſque mediocriter verſatum, locutio evincit. Grot. in Marc. i.

Luke a Physician of Antioch more liberally educated, wrote with more elegance. Understood little Hebrew,

St. Luke, was a Phyſician of *Antioch*, and having had on that account a more liberal education than the reſt, is obſerved to have written with more elegance and propriety. But it is probable, that he underſtood little or nothing of the *Hebrew*; ſince he conſtantly draws his citations of the Old Teſtament from the *Septuagint Verſion*, which *St. Jerom* ſeems to aſcribe to his *want of ſkill in the Hebrew* [a]. *But this excuſe*, as *Eraſmus* ſays, *will hardly ſatisfy thoſe who believe every thing, that belonged to the Apoſtles, to have been beſtowed on them by the Holy Ghoſt, and eſpecially the gift of tongues* [b].

Jerom

Erasmus.

John the most illiterate, and barbarous.

St. John, as both the antients and the moderns with one voice declare, was, of all the Apoſtles, the moſt barbarous in his language, and ignorant of letters. "Being the ſon of a Fiſherman "and himſelf alſo of the ſame trade, he might learn the law "when a child, ſays *Grotius*, as it was the cuſtom with the Jews, "but had no ſort of tincture, either of the Hebrew or Greek "literature; and his Greek ſtile is plainly formed after the *Syriac* "idiom of that age [c]."

Grotius

Paul, ignorant of Greek

St. Paul, the moſt eloquent of all the Apoſtles, and, as he declares of himſelf, indued alſo with *the gift of tongues more eminently than any man* [d]: yet, as ſome of the Antient Fathers teſtify, was either wholly ignorant, or but very moderately ſkilled in the *Greek*.

Jerom

St. Jerom, ſpeaking of *a certain perſon of diſtinguiſhed learning*, who affirmed him *to have been wholly unacquainted with it*, ſeems to

---

Jerom

[a] Evangeliſtam Lucam tradunt veteris Eccleſiæ tractatores, medicæ artis fuiſſe ſcientiſſimum, & magis Græcas litteras ſciſſe quam Hebræas. Unde & ſermo ejus—comptior eſt. Hieron. T. 3. p. 63, 64.

Erasmus

[b] Nam Lucam excuſat Hieronymus, haud ſcio quam commode, quod magis calluerit Græcas litteras quam Hebraicas.---Hanc excuſationem non admittent, opinor, qui quicquid in Apoſtolis fuit, divini Spiritus peculiare donum eſſe volunt; præcipue donum linguarum. in Matth. xiii. 14.

[c] Johannes Bethſaidenſis, Piſcatoris filius, piſcator & ipſe, legem quidem diſcere potuit puer, ut mos erat Hebræis, ceterum nulla tinctus fuit aut Hebraica aut Græca litteratura— hinc fit, ut ſupra ceteros Apoſtolos magna ſit in Johannis dictione ſimplicitas, & ſermo Græcus quidem, ſed plane adumbratus ex Syriaco illius ſeculi.— Grot. in Johan. c. i.

Grotius

[d] 1 Cor. xiv. 18.

cenſure that opinion as *ridiculous:* yet he himſelf, on other occaſions, does not ſcruple to paſs the ſame judgement upon him. "I ſtill approve, ſays he, what I have often ſaid before, that when *Paul* declares himſelf to be rude in ſpeech, he does not declare it out of any humility, but from the real ſenſe and conſciouſneſs of his own mind. For being an *Hebrew of the Hebrews*, and moſt eloquent in his own tongue, he could not expreſs the recondite ſenſes of the Goſpel in a foreign language." In other places he takes notice of the *ſolœciſms and blunders* which this Apoſtle was apt to make in the conſtruction of his words and ſentences; "and how he employed *Titus*, as *his interpreter of the* Greek *tongue*, to aſſiſt him in writing his epiſtles:" for which reaſon, we find him extremely grieved and not able *to take any reſt*, while *Titus* was abſent from him; but filled again with joy and comfort, tho' in the midſt of tribulations, when he met with *Titus* again in *Macedonia*, whither he went to ſeek him; being *the pipe and organ*, as *Jerom* expreſſes it, through *which he preached the Goſpel and ſung to Chriſt* [a].

rude in Speech

Titus his Interpreter.

his Pipe and organ

Hence in his Epiſtles, through a want of uſe and ſkill in writing Greek, it was his cuſtom, to ſcratch out the *laſt clauſe onely, or ſalutation, in his own hand,* as the mark of their being genuin: thus in the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*; *ſee*, ſays he, *with what huge letters I have written this, with my own hand.* Which we are not

Last Clause only in his own hand.

Jerom

[a] Vir apprime noſtris temporibus eruditus, miror quomodo rem ridiculam locutus ſit.—*Paulus*, inquit, *Hebræus erat, & Græcas litteras neſciebat.*— Hieron. Tom. 4. par. 1, 315.

Jerom

Illud quod crebro diximus, *Et ſi imperitus ſermone, non tamen ſcientia*, nequaquam *Paulum* de humilitate, ſed de conſcientiæ veritate dixiſſe, etiam nunc approbamus, &c. ibid. p. 204.

Iſte igitur, qui Solœciſmos in verbis facit, qui non poteſt hyperbaton reddere, ſententiamque concludere, audacter ſibi vendicat ſapientiam. Ibid. p. 348.

Hebræus igitur ex Hebræis, qui eſſet in vernaculo ſermone doctiſſimus, profundos ſenſus aliena lingua exprimere non valebat. Ib. p. 309, 409.

Habebat ergo *Titum* interpretem. — Ergo contriſtatur Paulus, quia prædicationis ſuæ in præſentiarum fiſtulam, organumque per quod Chriſto caneret, non invenerat: perrexitque in *Macedoniam*, ut ibi inveniret *Titum*, &c. Ibid. p. 183. See 2 Cor. ii. 13. vii. 5, 6.

Jerom,

Fistulam Organumque

Jerom.

to underſtand, according to *St. Jerom*, as if he had written *the whole Epiſtle* himſelf, but *that ſmall part onely which follows* [a]; and which thoſe antients ſeem to interpret, as if he had ſaid; *ſee with what deformed and awkward letters, I have ſcrawled out this ſubſcription, that from this attempt to do, what I am not able to execute without difficulty, you may collect the greatneſs of my zeal and love for you* [b].

Tertius

Silas.

In writing alſo to *the Romans*, he made uſe of *Tertius*, as his ſcribe, to draw up the Epiſtle for him: whom the learned take to be the ſame with that *Silas*, ſo frequently mentioned in the Acts, as his companion and attendant; who, writing here to the *Romans*, uſes his *Latin* name, *Tertius*, of the ſame import and interpretation, with his *Hebrew* name, שלוש [c]. But ſome are apt to inquire, why *St. Paul* in an Epiſtle to the *Romans*, ſhould chuſe to write in *Greek*, rather than in *Latin:* to whom *Grotius* gives this anſwer; "becauſe both the Apoſtle and his Secretary, tho' "not perhaps wholly ignorant of the *Latin*, were yet better qua-"lified, the one to dictate, and the other to write in *Greek* [d]." But whatever ſmattering either of them might poſſibly have of the *Latin*, it is certain, that they were both but ſlenderly acquainted with the *Greek*, as this very epiſtle demonſtrates; which in the judgement both of the antients and the moderns, is ſtrangely obſcure and perplexed; abounding with *hyperbatons*; and employing the ſame words in various ſenſes; and borrowing ſeveral of them from *the peculiar dialect of Cilicia* [e].

Grotius

Epistle to the Romons
obscure, purplexed
Cilician

St.

Jerom

[a] Et ne aliqua ſuppoſitæ Epiſtolæ ſuſpicio naſceretur, ab hoc loco uſque ad finem, manu ſua ipſe perſcripſit, oſtendens ſuperiora ab alio exarata. Ibid. p. 314.

Jerom

[b] Et quia neceſſitas expetebat, ut manu ſua Epiſtolam ſubſcriberet, contra conſuetudinem curvos tramites litterarum, vix magnis apicibus exprimebat: etiam in hoc, ſuæ ad Galatas indicia caritatis oſtendens, quod propter illos, id quoque, quod non poterat, facere conaretur. Ibid. p. 315.

[c] Vid. Lightfoot, Horæ Hebraic. p. 883. in Cor. i. 1.

Grotius

[d] Credo id eo factum, quod & ipſe & Scriba ejus, *Tertius*, nomine, quanquam fortaſſe Latini ſermonis non prorſus ignari, Græce tamen rectius ille dictaret, hic ſcriberet. in Rom. i. 1.

Erasmus,

[e] Queritur *Origenes*, hanc interpretans Epiſtolam, Græcam dictionem eſſe perplexam,

St. Peter alſo is ſaid to have had his ſcribes, as well as *St. Paul*, and in particular, to have employed *Mark the Evangeliſt*, as his *Greek* interpreter; and *St. Jerom* aſcribes *that difference of ſtile*, which is obſerved *between his two epiſtles, to the different ſecretaries, whom he happened to uſe for each of them* [a]. And this is ſuppoſed to have been the caſe of all the other Apoſtles: "for being all "of them, ſays *Salmaſius*, *Galilæans* and *Hebrews*, they had "each their ſeveral companions and aſſociates in the miniſtry of "preaching the Goſpel: who were partly *Grecians* born in *Syria*, "and acquainted therefore with the *Syriac*; and partly *Syrians*, "who, by converſing with the *Grecians*, had acquired the uſe "alſo of the *Greek* tongue. Theſe they employed as interpreters, to tranſlate into *Greek*, what they dictated to them in the "*Hebrew* or *Syriac*.——This, adds he, is expreſsly declared of "ſome; not ſo well known of others, becauſe not ſo declared; "but probable of them all, becauſe certain of ſome of them.— "Hence all thoſe *Syriaſms*, which are ſpread over the whole text "of the New Teſtament, and bear the clear marks of a tranſla"tion, made, as it were, word for word [b]."

Peter employs Mark

Jerom

Salmasius.

Grecians born in Syria

Syrians conversing with Greeks.

These Interpreters translated into Greek, what was dictated in Hebrew or Syriac.

I ſhall onely add to theſe teſtimonies, a paſſage from *St. Chryſoſtom*, very appoſite to the preſent purpoſe; in which that Father tells us, "how he once happened to hear a ridiculous diſ"pute between *a Greek and a Chriſtian*, on this very ſubject— "the *Greek* maintained, that *Paul* was utterly illiterate; the "Chriſtian on the other hand, was ſimple enough to affirm, "that he was more eloquent even than *Plato*. By which they, "each of them ſeverally, hurt their own cauſe. For if *Paul* "was really the more learned of the two, the wonder would "preſently ceaſe, how he came to get the better of *Plato*, and to

Chryſoſtom's Dispute between a Greek and a Christian.

Paul drew the Followers of Plato to himself.

---

plexam, & hyperbatis obſcuratam, & e Cilicum idiomate quædam parum Græca peregrinitatem reſipere. Eraſm. in Rom. i. 7. Vid. Origen. Comment. p. 429. Edit. Huet. It. Hieron. T. 4. par. 1. p. 180.

[a] Denique & duæ Epiſtolæ, quæ feruntur *Petri*, ſtylo inter ſe & charactere diſcrepant, ſtructuraque verborum. Ex quo intelligimus, pro neceſſitate rerum, diverſis eum uſum interpretibus. Hier. ib. p. 183.

Jerom

[b] Vid. Salmaſ. Comment. de Helleniſt. p. 256, 258.

Salmasius.

“draw all his followers to himſelf; ſince it would appear to be owing to the ſuperiority of his talents, not to the divine grace: whereas if *Paul*, illiterate as he was, could vanquiſh the learned *Plato*, ſuch a victory was glorious, and the hand of God manifeſt in it. Wherefore he exhorts the Chriſtians, whenever they heard any of the *Greeks* contemning the learning of the Apoſtles, to depreciate it ſtill more, and inſtead of extolling the wiſdom of *Paul*, to extoll rather all thoſe, who were admired among the Gentiles, for their learning and eloquence; and to declare their own Apoſtles at the ſame time, to be *barbarous and unlearned*; for that was the onely way, to confound their adverſaries in the end, and gain a noble victory over them [a].”

Exhortation to Christians to extoll the Gentile Learning and declare the Apostles barbarous.

Victory!

Theſe facts and authorities manifeſtly prove, that the gift of tongues, was not of a laſting or perpetual kind, but given onely on certain important occaſions, as an *illuſtrious ſign*, to thoſe firſt preachers of the Goſpel, that a divine power continued to accompany them, and crowned their labors with ſucceſs; and when this particular end was ſerved, the gift itſelf was preſently withdrawn. The ſame facts alſo demonſtrate, that the languages, which the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts afterwards uſed, as well in their ſeveral writings, as in preaching the Goſpel to foreign nations, were not the fruit of this gift, or of divine inſpiration, but merely ſuch, as they had been taught to ſpeak from their birth, or had acquired by practice and converſation with thoſe, among whom they reſided: and that we may ſay with great truth of every one of them, what was ſaid in particular of *St. Peter*, *Thou art ſurely a Galilæan, for thy ſpeech betrayeth thee* [b].

Every One of the Apostles proved to be Galileans by their Speech.

Galilæans.

Since the Apoſtles then cannot be ſuppoſed to have received their language from heaven; it will be aſked perhaps, by what human means they could acquire that knowledge of the *Greek*, of which they appear to have been poſſeſſed. But this will admit a very eaſy ſolution, if we recollect, what all the learned allow, that the *Greek* language prevailed and floriſhed in common uſe, through the greateſt part of the eaſtern world. *The* Latin *tongue is confined indeed within narrow bounds,* ſays *Cicero, but the* Greek *is read almoſt by all nations* [a]. Hence flowed that cuſtom, ſo common with the ſacred writers, of dividing all mankind into *Jews* and *Greeks* [b]. But what is moſt to our purpoſe; we find the *Greek* tongue to have been generally current alſo in *Judæa* and in the City of *Jeruſalem* itſelf; in which there ſeem to have been ſeveral *Greek Synagogues* [c]. The province of *Galilee* alſo was divided between *the Jews* and *the Greeks*; and *Capernaum* the Metropolis was in the *Grecian* diviſion [d]. The city of *Gadara* too, where *Jeſus* ſent *the Legion of Devils into the Swine*, and *Cana* likewiſe, where he wrought his firſt miracle, were under the ſame juriſdiction [e].

---

[a] Vid. Chryſoſt. Op. T. 3. p. 76.

[b] Matt. xxvi. 73.

Greek, in common use, thro' the greatest part of the Eastern World.
Cicero.
Greek current in Judea in Jerusalem. Greek Synagogues.
Galilee, Capernaum, Gadara Cana.

Now it was in theſe very parts, where our Saviour principally reſided, and gathered all his Apoſtles: two of whom have *Grecian* names, *Philip* and *Andrew*, and a third, two different names, *Thomas* and *Didymus*, the one *Hebrew*, the other *Greek*; by the firſt of which he was called among the Jews, by the ſecond, among the Gentiles [f]. It is certain alſo, that in *Jeruſalem*, a great number of the firſt converts were *Greeks*: inſomuch that the Apoſtles found it neceſſary, to ſelect *ſeven of the moſt eminent Diſciples*, to be ſet apart for the particular buſineſs of providing for the maintenance of the *Grecian widows*. *And they choſe* Stephen, *a man full of faith, and of the Holy Ghoſt, and* Philip *and* Prochorus, *and* Nicanor, *and* Timon, *and* Parmenas, *and* Nicolas *a proſelyte of* Antioch [g]. Where it is remarkable, that all the ſeven have *Grecian* names, and were conſequently of *Grecian*

Philip, Andrew Thomas
A great number of the first Con=verts in Jerusalem, were Greeks.
Grecian Widows
Seven Grecian names

---

[a] Orat. pr. Archia.

[b] Acts xiv. 1. xviii. 4. xix. 10, &c.

[c] Acts vi. 9. Vid. Lightfoot, p. 929.

[d] Galilæa Gentium — in qua eſt *Capernaum* Galilææ Metropolis. Zeger. in Johan. iv. 43, 44.

[e] Eſt enim *Cana*, in Galilæa gentium, oppidum, quod *Hieronymus* in *Hebraicis locis* teſtatur ætate ſua adhuc extitiſſe. Eraſm. in Joh. ii. 1. De Gadara. Vid. Sculteti Exercitat. Evangel. l. 2. c. 49.

[f] John xi. 16.

[g] Acts vi. 5.

Nicodemus

Lightfoot

Greek honoured by the Jrs
as much as Hebrews.

families: and as the laſt of them is particularly diſtinguiſhed by the character of *a proſelyte of* Antioch, ſo it is probable, that the reſt were natives of *Jeruſalem:* to whom we may add *Nicodemus*, a perſon of ſenatorian rank, and a member of the great *Sanhedrim*, yet, as we may collect from his name, of *Greek* extraction alſo [a]. From all which we ſee the reaſon, of what the learned Dr. *Lightfoot* declares, "that the *Greek* language was "in ſuch uſe and honor with the Jewiſh nation, that it was pre- "ferred to all others, and held by the Doctors themſelves, in "the ſame rank with their native tongue [b]."

Erasmus.

To conclude then: it is reaſonable to imagine, that the Apoſtles, who were born and bred, and ſpent their whole lives among thoſe, who *ſpoke Greek*, might acquire a moderate knowledge of that tongue, even from their childhood. For this is natural and common to the moſt illiterate, to catch ſome imperfect uſe of a foreign language, which they hear conſtantly ſpoken by all around them. But if we ſuppoſe them, to have made but little or no acquaintance with it, in their younger years, it is probable, that the neceſſities of their Apoſtolic function, and the taſk of preaching the Goſpel, might induce them to apply themſelves to the acquiſition of it, even in their advanced life. This I find to have been the opinion of *Eraſmus*, who ſays; "it "is not ſtrange, that when *Ægypt*, *Syria*, *Cilicia*, and all the "leſſer *Aſia* talked *Greek*, the Apoſtles ſhould acquire the know- "ledge of it without a miracle, when they lived ſo many years "among thoſe who ſpoke it. Nor were the Goſpels preſently "written by them. A ſtranger, who lives in *France*, will learn "to ſpeak *French* in a year's time, tho' he knew nothing of it "before: and can we wonder then, that the Apoſtles, in ſo "many years, ſhould gain a moderate ſkill in the *Greek* [c].

Salmasius.

Salmaſius alſo was of the ſame opinion, that the greateſt part of the Apoſtles learnt the *Greek* tongue but very late; and not till they were commanded to preach the Goſpel to all nations [a]. *Grotius* likewiſe declares in particular of *St. John*, "that he had "no tincture either of the *Hebrew* or *Greek* litterature, but might "perhaps have gained ſome ſhare of each, when he was old, in "*Aſia*, where he ſpent the greateſt part of his days to an extreme "age; partly in the *Iſle of Patmos*, to which he was baniſhed, "and partly at *Epheſus*, both before and after his baniſhment, as "all the antients teſtify."

---

[a] John iii. 1.

[b] Lightf. Hor. Hebr. in Matt. i. p. 253. It. Chron. Tempor. p. 110.

[c] Eraſm. in Acts x. 38.

Grotius
No Tincture of Litterature
Greek or Hebrew,
John ſpent the greateſt part of his
days in Aſia, Patmos Epheſus.

This opinion therefore of thoſe great and learned men, that *the Apoſtles acquired their* Greek *knowledge chiefly in their later years*, ſeems on the whole, to be the moſt probable, and moſt agreeable alſo, to what the antient writers have delivered concerning them. There were but two of the whole number, who wrote any Goſpels, *Matthew* and *John*: of whom *Matthew*, as it is ſaid above, wrote his Goſpel in *Hebrew*, as having but little or no knowledge of the *Greek*; and *John* did not write his *Greek* Goſpel, till he was extremely old, and had lived many years in *Aſia*. The other two Evangeliſts, *Mark* and *Luke*, are declared by all, to have been the companions and interpreters of the Apoſtles, *Peter* and *Paul*; and were not therefore, ſo properly the authors, as the Scribes onely of thoſe Goſpels, which paſs under their names [b].

But 2 Who wrote Gospels.
Mathew and John. By two
Witneſses Facts are proved.

Mark and Luke, not Authors
but Scribes of their Gospels.

---

[a] Grot. in John i. 1.

Iren.

[b] Μάρκ☉ ὁ μαθήτης καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρυ, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρυ κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. Καὶ Λυκᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀκόλυθος Παύλυ, τὸ ὑπ᾽ ἐκείνυ κηρυσσόμενον ἐυαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο. Iren. Adv. Hæreſ. l. 3. c. 1.

Who?

We are told alſo by ſome of the Antients, that when *St. Paul*, in his Epiſtles, ſpeaks of *my Goſpel* and *our Goſpel*, [2 Tim. ii. 8. 2 Theſſ. ii. 14.] He means *the Goſpel of his Secretary and Interpreter*, *St.* Luke. God bearing them witneſs with ſigns and wonders, according to his own will. Heb. ii. 4. There was a Gospel of St. Paul, Suppreſsed, because Spurious.

Jerom

Oſtenditur Galatas—dona habuiſſe virtutum—& tamen poſt tanta (quia forſitan gratiam diſcernendorum Spirituum non habebant) a falſis Doctoribus irretiti ſunt. Obſervandum etiam quod operari virtutes dicantur in his, qui non tenent Evangelii veritatem, &c. Hier. in Galat. c. 3. Op. T. 4.

Eraſmus.

Semel duntaxat legimus Apoſtolos novis linguis loquentes — quanquam vero propius eſt Apoſtolos id temporis unica lingua fuiſſe locutos, ac virtute divina factum, ut ab omnibus æque intelligerentur. Eraſm. in Act. x. 38.

SOME

SOME SHORT
REMARKS
ON A
STORY told by the ANTIENTS,
CONCERNING
ST. *JOHN* the EVANGELIST,
AND
CERINTHUS the HERETIC;
AND
On the uſe, which is made of it by the Moderns, to enforce the Duty of ſhunning Heretics.

SOME SHORT REMARKS ON A STORY told by the ANTIENTS, &c.

THE ſtory, which I am going to examine, is told by *Irenæus* in the following manner; "that there were ſome, "who had heard *Polycarp* relate, how *St. John*, the "diſciple of our Lord, going one day to the public bath in "*Epheſus*, and finding the Heretic *Cerinthus* in it, ſtarted back "inſtantly without bathing, crying out; let us run away, leſt "the bath ſhould fall upon us, while *Cerinthus*, the enemy of "truth, is in it [a]."

Irenæus, from Policarp, by hearsay
John at a Bath in Ephesus,
Starts from Cerinthus, the Enemy of Truth.

This ſtory is applied by *Dr. Berriman*, in one of his Sermons, to inforce the duty of *ſhunning Infidels and Heretics:* and by *Dr. Waterland*, to recommend a practice, which he warmly preſſes upon all Chriſtians, of rejecting from their ſociety and communion, *all the impugners of fundamentals* [b]*:* And it is ſure to be thrown in our way, either from the pulpit or the preſs, by all angry Divines, as oft as they find occaſion, to inflame the people againſt an Antagoniſt, whom, through zeal or heat of controverſy, they are diſpoſed to treat as an adverſary to the Chriſtian faith.

---

[a] Καὶ εἰσὶν οἱ ἀκηκοότες αὐτȣ̃, ὅτι Ἰωάννης, &c. Iren. l. 3. c. 3.

[b] See Dr. *Waterl.* Import. of the Doctr. of the Trin. p. 105, 127. it. *Berrim.* On ſhunning Heret. p. 352.

Since this ſtory then, as it is commonly applied, naturally tends, to excite prejudices, and uncharitable averſions in the minds of men, and is conſidered generally by zealots, as an Apoſtolic rule and precedent, for the exerciſe of all kinds of rudeneſs towards thoſe, who differ from them in matters of religion, I cannot but think it of uſe to the public quiet, to inquire into the real ſtate of it, and not to ſuffer it to have any other credit or influence, than what is ſtrictly due to it: for in that great uncharitableneſs, which reigns among all the Sects of Chriſtians in theſe days, there is no occaſion to ranſack antiquity, for any additional motives of ſtrife and mutual hatred.—— I ſhall conſider therefore,

1ſt, What objections may reaſonably be offered to the truth of it, as well from the nature of the evidence, as the matter of the ſtory itſelf.

2dly, Shall ſhew, that tho' we allow it to be true, it cannot juſtify the uſe, to which the Doctors abovementioned, and many others have applied it.

1. As to the evidence of the ſtory, it reſts on the ſingle teſtimony of *Irenæus*, and that given to us, at ſecond hand onely, or from hearſay: for he does not ſay, that he received it himſelf from *Polycarp*, tho' when young he had ſeen and converſed with him, but that *ſome of Polycarp's diſciples* had heard him relate it; of which number there were many, who had converſed with him more familiarly, and frequently than *Irenæus*. Since he received it then from certain perſons unknown, who received it from *Polycarp*, who received it from *St. John*, there is room enough to ſuppoſe, that he might poſſibly be deceived in it: which conſidering the character of the man, and of the age, wherein he lived, can hardly be thought an unreaſonable ſuppoſition.

Irenæus.

But if we ſhould allow, what many are apt to infer from this paſſage, that *Irenæus* meant here to ſignify that it was he himſelf, who heard the ſtory from *Polycarp*; we are then to conſider, what degree of credit may be due to his teſtimony. But this I have already conſidered at large in a former treatiſe: in which

I have

I have ſhewn, that tho' of all the Fathers, whoſe works now remain to us, he was the moſt diligent collector of *Apoſtolic traditions*, and had gathered them, as he affirms, *from the mouths of antient men, who had converſed with the Apoſtles themſelves*; yet in every ſingle inſtance of them, which he has particularly recorded, and peremptorily atteſted, he was either deluded himſelf, or has willfully deluded others, by a falſe and forged pretence of Apoſtolic authority. Among many examples, which I have there produced in the ſupport of this charge, the following one will ſufficiently teach us, how far we may depend upon his fidelity.

A Fool, or a Knave.

There were certain Heretics in thoſe days, with whom *Irenæus* was diſputing, who allowed but *one and thirty years* to our Saviour's life, and the *laſt of them alone* to his miniſtry: in contradiction to whom, *Irenæus* roundly affirms, *that our Saviour actually lived to an old age, and was fifty years old at leaſt at the time of his death*: for which he alledges *the unanimous teſtimony of all the old men, who had lived with St. John in Aſia, and received this account from him*; *ſome of whom*, he ſays, *had ſeen the other Apoſtles alſo, and heard the ſame from them all, and bore witneſs accordingly to the truth of it* [a]. Now it is not poſſible, that any tradition can be more authentically delivered than this, by one of the moſt venerable Biſhops of the primitive Church, who lived within a few years after the Apoſtles themſelves; yet it is certain, as the warmeſt admirers of antiquity in general, and of *Irenæus* in particular, muſt own, that neither *St. John*, nor any other of the Apoſtles, could ever declare ſuch a ſtory to any one; and that the whole therefore muſt be a mere fiction, either of thoſe antient men, who had converſed with the Apoſtles, or of *Irenæus* himſelf, who pretended to have heard it from them, as being utterly inconſiſtent with the hiſtory of the Goſpel.

A marvelous Anecdote.
Jesus 50 years old.

Irenæus. [a] Iren. l. 2. c. 39. Quidam autem eorum non ſolum Joannem, ſed & alios Apoſtolos viderunt, & hæc eadem ab ipſis audierunt & teſtantur de hujuſmodi relatione.

But

Gospel in few hands.

Apostolic Tradition

But the Goſpel was then onely in a few hands; and *Apoſtolic tradition* the ſhorteſt way of ſilencing thoſe Heretics; being an argument of the greateſt weight with thoſe, who believed it, and what could not eaſily be confuted by thoſe, who did not. The pious Editor of *Irenæus*'s works makes the following remark upon the place; "*Irenæus*, ſays he, affirms in expreſs words, that "Chriſt continued to teach beyond *the fortieth*, or even *the fiftieth* "*year of his age*; which he endeavours to confirm by texts of "Scripture, and by reaſons alſo, tho' weak ones, which the "common judgement of the Church has rejected. We ought "however to judge candidly of the bleſſed Martyr, who, *by an* "*impetus of confuting the Heretics*, was carried into the contrary "extreme: a caſe, which, as it is manifeſt, has frequently hap-"pened to the moſt holy and learned men [1]." But ſince *Irenæus*'s whole life and writings were peculiarly devoted to the confutation of Hereſy, what is it, that the moſt candid can poſſibly judge on this occaſion, but that the ſame *impetus of confuting them*, which carried him beyond the truth in one caſe, would carry him the ſame length in another, and prompt him to uſe every argument, which could promote ſo good a cauſe?

John afraid? of Cerinthus too?

This ſuſpicion will be confirmed, not onely by the conduct of *Irenæus* in other ſimilar caſes, but by the matter of the ſtory itſelf, which on many accounts ſeems to imply a behaviour unworthy of the character of *an Apoſtle*; to whoſe dignity it would have been more agreeable, inſtead of running out of the Bath himſelf, to have driven *Cerinthus* out before him. *Reſiſt the Devil and he will flee*, is an injunction given to every private Chriſtian: and it is much more the part of an Apoſtle, to reſiſt and diſarm an Heretic; whereas ſo precipitate a flight betrays fear and diffidence, and gives an occaſion of triumph to the Adverſary.

Childish!

The reaſon alſo, ſaid to be given by him for his flight, is childiſh and ſuperſtitious: *leſt the bath ſhould fall, becauſe Cerinthus*

[*a*] Diſertis verbis affirmat Chriſtum ultra quadrageſimum, aut etiam quinquageſimum annum docuiſſe, &c. Vid. Fevardent. Not. 4. in Iren. ibid.

was in it. As if it had been uſual with God, to exert his judgements in that manner on notorious ſinners, by burying them under the ruins of walls and houſes: a notion, which ſeems to be expreſsly diſcouraged and exploded by Chriſt himſelf [*a*]. Or if there was any cauſe to apprehend, that God would take ſo extraordinary a method of puniſhing the Heretic, there was a greater ſtill, to be aſſured, that he would provide at the ſame time, in ſome way as extraordinary, for the ſafety of the Apoſtle: it being weak to imagine, that when he had ſpared the life of ſo profligate an enemy to that day, he ſhould be in ſuch haſt at laſt to deſtroy him, as to involve his old and faithfull ſervant in the ſame ruin.

The conduct of the other Apoſtles towards the profeſs'd adverſaries of the Goſpel was quite contrary to this of *St. John*, as we find it deſcribed in the Hiſtory of their Acts; where we read how *Peter* rebuked and confounded the Prince and Leader of all Heretics, *Simon Magus*, who had bewitched the people of *Samaria*, by his Sorceries, and was revered by them as a Deity. And if any credit be due to Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, we are there told, that when the ſame *Simon* was playing his magical tricks again in *Rome*, in defiance and oppoſition to the Goſpel, and, by the help of his familiar Dæmons, was flying briſkly in the air, *St. Peter*, by the force of his prayers, brought him down from the ſky, with ſo precipitate a tumble, that he was daſhed to pieces by the fall, in the ſight of all the people. Thus, when *St. Paul* likewiſe was oppoſed and obſtructed in preaching the Goſpel, by another Sorcerer and falſe Prophet, called *Elymas*, he firſt reproached him ſharply for his Diabolical practices, and then, *in the name of the Lord, ſtruck him inſtantly blind.* And this is the conduct, which one would have expected from an Apoſtle, upon an encounter with *Cerinthus*, the chief Heretic and adverſary of the Goſpel then living, that he would either have confuted and put him to ſhame by the force of his reaſoning, or confounded

Peter against Simon, in Samaria.

Simon flying, Peter brought down. See Acts of Paul and Thecla. &c.

Paul against Elymas.

[*a*] Luke xiii. 1.

him by ſome act of that extraordinary power, with which he was indued from above.

John all Love.

Jerom.

Children love one another

But *St. John*, as *Dr. Waterland* declares, *was all love, meekneſs, and charity* [a]: and this indeed is ſaid to have been his peculiar character, above that of the other Apoſtles. And we are told of him by *St. Jerom*, "that in his extreme age, when he uſed to be "carried to the Church by his diſciples, it was his cuſtom, to "do nothing more, than repeat this ſingle exhortation; *my little* "*children, love one another*: and when the people grew tired with "hearing nothing elſe from him but that one precept, and aſked, "why he continued always to repeat the ſame thing; he an- "ſwered; *it is a ſaying worthy of John, and a precept of our* "*Lord, and if you practiſe this alone, it is ſufficient* [b]." The ſame doctrine, of love, charity, and mutual benevolence, was eminently propagated alſo by his two principal Scholars, *Ignatius, and Polycarp*: *what thanks are due to you*, ſays *Ignatius*, *if you love onely the good diſciples? you muſt ſubdue rather the more peſtilent ſort, by your mildneſs and gentleneſs* [c]. And *Polycarp* ſpeaking of one, who had fallen away from the faith, ſays; *be moderate on this occaſion, and look not on ſuch as enemies, but call them back, as ſuffering and erring members* [d].

Ignatius

Polycarp.

Captain of Robbers.

How much more amiable then, and agreeably to his proper character, is this ſame Apoſtle repreſented in another ſtory, delivered alſo by the antients, concerning his painfull and affectionate purſuit, of the *Captain of a band of robbers*; whom he followed into the mountains, and by his affectionate and paternal remonſtrances, brought back from the head of his crew, and reſtored to the Church [e]? yet from this charitable and benevolent act, *Dr. Waterland* has contrived to draw a moſt perverſe and pernicious inference, *that by flying from the Heretic and run-*

---

[a] See Import. of the Doctr. of the Trin. p. 152.

[b] Nihil aliud per ſingulas ſolebat proferre collectas, niſi hoc, *Filioli diligite alterutrum*, &c. Hieron. Op. T. 4. p. 314.

[c] Vid. Ignat. Ep. ad Polycarp. §. 11.

[d] Vid. Polycarp. Ep. ad Philip. §. 11.

[e] Vid. Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 3. c. 23.

ning after the robber, he ſhewed, how much more he deteſted Hereſies, than common immoralities [a].

Waterlands aversion to Heresy.

It is obſervable likewiſe, that this ſtory is related with no ſmall variation by the Antients themſelves. *Epipanius* tells it more than once, not of *Cerinthus*, but of another Hæretic, called *Ebion:* and *why might not both of them*, ſays the Editor of *Irenæus*, *be found together in the bath at the ſame time?* *Baronius* makes the ſame ſuppoſition, to reconcile the two Fathers; while others ſuppoſe, that *Cerinthus* and *Ebion* are but different names of the ſame perſon [b]: Yet *Tertullian* expreſsly diſtinguiſhes them, and calls *Ebion the Succeſſor of Cerinthus* [c]. But *Mr. Tillemont* ſolves the matter more judiciouſly by remarking, that there is no need of ſuch conjectures, becauſe it is common with *Epiphanius* to make blunders in hiſtory; *who has added*, he ſays, *ſeveral other particulars, both trifling and improbable, to this very ſtory.* One of the particulars, which he has added, is this; *that St. John had never before made uſe of the public baths, till he was ſent thither on this occaſion by a divine inſpiration, to give this open teſtimony of his deteſtation of Hereſy.* Some of the other Fathers as well as *Epiphanius*, declare *Cerinthus to have been the diſciple of Carpocrates*, who was not in being, as the Chronologers tell us, till *after the death of St. John*; and if ſo, this whole ſtory muſt of courſe fall to the ground.

Epiphanius
Ebion
Baronius
Ebion Successor of Cerinthus
Epiphanius a Blunderer.
Carpocrates.

The Moderns alſo, in their turn, have added ſome embelliſhments to the ſame ſtory. *Fevardentius* in his notes on this paſſage of *Irenæus*, ſays, that *St. Jerom*, in his treatiſe againſt the *Luciferians*, affirms, *that immediately after the retreat of St. John, the bath actually fell down and cruſhed Cerinthus to death.* Yet there is not the leaſt intimation of any ſuch fact, as *Dr. Grabe* obſerves, either in that, or any other part of *St. Jerom*'s works [d]. Another writer with as little truth, aſſerts the ſame thing, on the authority of venerable *Bede*; and ſome alſo appeal to *Polycarp*,

Modern Fictions.

---

[a] See *Waterl.* ibid. p. 152.

[b] Vid. Fevardent. Not. 2. In Iren. ibid. & Baron. ad Ann. 74.

[c] Vid. Oper. p. 252. B.

[d] Vid. Iren. Oper. Edit. Oxon. p. 204. Not. 2.

as the voucher of it; and all of them take occaſion, to moralize upon it with great gravity, as an inſtance of God's judgements upon Hæretics [*a*].

From theſe remarks upon the ſtory, I ſhall procede to the leſſon, which is drawn from it by the two Doctors above mentioned, and ſhew,

2dly, That, tho' we allow the fact to be true, it will not juſtify the uſe, to which they have applied it.

Now the conſtant uſe, which is made of this ſtory, is to demonſtrate the duty *of ſhunning and affronting Hæretics*; *of denying them the common offices of civility*; *treating them as perſons excommunicated, and deteſtable in the eyes of God and man:* and this preſſed upon all Chriſtians by the authority and example of *St. John* [*b*].

But I would aſk, whether a behaviour of this ſort be agreeable to the ordinary temper and ſpirit of the Goſpel, or of that *Jeſus*, who came into the world, as *a Phyſician to the ſick*; and in that character, ſought out *the Publican*, and *the Sinner*, for the opportunity of healing them; and preferred the *Hæretical Sad-*

Bayle.

[*a*] *Monſr. Bayle,* who mentions this ſtory with all theſe particulars, makes the following remark upon it. "Obſerve, ſays he, the progreſs of it. *Irenæus* was probably the firſt who publiſhed it, and contented himſelf with relating barely, what he had heard. But thoſe, who came after him, finding his narrative too ſimple and naked, added ſome embroidery to it. They fancied it diſhonorable to the memory of the Apoſtle, to have it believed, that he had ever made uſe of the public baths: they affirmed therefore, that he had never done it before, and was ſent thither on this occaſion, by the expreſs command of heaven. It was neceſſary in the next place, to find out a good reaſon for ſo particular an inſpiration: and a reaſon was preſently found; viz. the importance of letting the faithfull know, what an horror they all ought to conceive againſt the enemies of the truth; and how the divine juſtice was always ready to exert itſelf by ſome exemplary ſeverity againſt an Arch-Heretic. Laſtly, as it might ſeem indecent, for *St. John* to be thought liable to any vain and unneceſſary fear, ſo it was found convenient to ſuppoſe, that the Heretic, with whom he refuſed to bath himſelf, was cruſhed to pieces by the fall of the houſe." Vid. Artic. Cerinthus Not. D. in Dictionaire.

[*b*] See Import. of the Doctr. of the Trin. c. 4. p. 122, &c.

ducee, and *the Schiſmatical Samaritan*, to the *fierce Zealot*, and the *Orthodox Phariſee?* No, it is ſo far from being conformable to the ordinary rules of Chriſtian duty, that it was copied, as *Dr. Berriman* himſelf owns, from *the Jewiſh inſtitutes* [a]*:* as if it flowed from that principle, by which this ſame Apoſtle, while yet raw and unacquainted with the benevolent temper of his new religion, was calling down *fire from heaven on the Samaritans, after the example of Elias*, and was reproved accordingly by our Lord, *for not knowing what manner of ſpirit he was of* [b].

If I ſhould aſk theſe Gentlemen alſo, what it is, that they mean by the word *Hæretic*; we ſhould find in the end, that they meant nothing more by it, than one, who differed from them in any article of religion, which they held to be important. *Dr. Waterland* calls him, an *open Impugner of fundamentals*, and labours to prove, that we ought not to hold communion with any of that character [c]. And ſhould we aſk once more, *what are theſe fundamentals?* he would refer us without doubt in the firſt place to *the doctrine of the Trinity:* whence I have drawn the teſtimonies above aſcribed to him. *The importance of which* makes the ſubject of that very book; and this doctrine indeed is held ſo fundamental by the Papiſts, that the diſbelief of it, tho' but ſecretly entertained by a Prieſt, is declared to annull the whole efficacy of his miniſtry, and of the Sacraments themſelves, not onely to himſelf, but to all others, how innocent ſoever, to whom he ſhould happen to adminiſter them. But among Proteſtants, the diſtinction of fundamentals, has been conſtantly applied to thoſe doctrines alone, which are clearly and preciſely delivered in the holy Scriptures: and how far this character will ſuit with the doctrine of the Trinity, I leave to others to determine: yet this I think, we need not ſcruple to ſay, that it is no where expreſsly declared by any of the earlieſt Fathers; and as the moſt learned among the Papiſts aſſert, was never affirmed or taught by the Church, before the Council of *Nice* [d].

The doctrine of the Trinity.

Trinity not taught by y Chh.
before the Council of Nice.

---

[a] Sermon. Vol. 2. p. 351.

[b] Luke ix. 55.

[c] Import. &c. c. 4.

[d] See Chillingw. Pref. §. 18, 33.

Irenæus, ſpeaking of the Moſaic diſtinction of animals into *clean and unclean*, ſays; "the law foretold all theſe things figuratively, by animals denoting men: thoſe which divide the hoof and chew the cud, it pronounces clean: thoſe, which do neither, unclean. Who then are clean? thoſe, who go on firmly, believing *in the Father and in the Son. For this is the firmneſs of thoſe, who have the double hoof* [a]." Hence we ſee, that the fundamental doctrine, or the firmneſs of the Chriſtian faith, in this early age was, to believe in *the Father and in the Son*. In the ages next following, many different opinions ſucceſſively prevailed, and were held orthodox in their turns: but as ſoon as the *Arian* controverſy began to diſturb the peace of the Church, *Conſtantine the Great* wrote a letter, in common to *Arius* and *Alexander* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, the oppoſite chiefs in the diſpute, in which he treats the whole quæſtion, "as vain, fooliſh and impertinent; as a diſpute of words without ſenſe, which none could explane, nor any comprehend; as the fruit of idleneſs and leiſure miſemployed, which no way affected the ſumm of religion; and that to quarrel about ſuch trifles and ſubtleties, was childiſh, and below the gravity of Prieſts; wherefore he earneſtly exhorts them to put an end to ſo ſilly a conteſt, productive of nothing but quarrels and blaſphemies among the people; and to return to their former friendſhip and communion with each other."

Irenaus

double hoof

Constantine's letter to Arius and his Antagonist.

This letter was ſent by *Hoſius*, a learned and venerable Biſhop; chiefly intruſted by the Emperor in the affairs of the Church; and is commended both by *Euſebius* and *Socrates*, as *excellent, admirable, and full of wiſdom* [b]. Which ſhews, what was the opinion both of the Church and the State, with regard to this quæſtion, or *parting point*, as *Dr. Waterland* calls it, before the Council of *Nice*.

Hosius

Eusebius Socrates

Opinion of Chh and State before the Council of Nice.

---

[a] Iren. l. 5. c. 8.

[b] Vid. Euſeb. Vit. Conſtant. l. 2. c. 64. &c. it. Socrat. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 1. c. 7.

But to return to our ſtory of *St. John* and *Cerinthus.* If we allow it to be true, the conduct of *St. John* cannot be conſidered in any other light, than as an extraordinary caſe, or the effect of that divine power, which was peculiar to the Apoſtles, and ceaſed with the Apoſtolic age; by which they were inabled to penetrate the hearts of men, and diſcern the ſecret motives, that actuated thoſe early corruptors of the Chriſtian faith. *Epiphanius*, as I have already intimated, declares it to have been ſuggeſted by a ſpecial inſpiration. It is abſurd therefore, to propoſe an act, directed by an extraordinary commiſſion from heaven, as a rule of proceding in ordinary caſes: and it would make wild work among us, for weak and fallible men to revive and exerciſe a diſcipline, which was grounded on infallibility; and to pretend to judge, with an Apoſtolic authority, of the hearts and ſpirits of their fellow Chriſtians, without the Apoſtolic gift of diſcerning thoſe ſpirits; yet this is one of the principal points, which is preſſed by *Dr. Waterland*, through his whole treatiſe on *the Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity.*

Epiphanius
a Special Inspiration

The ſame Doctor however, on a different occaſion, where he is vindicating the morality of certain acts, related of the antient Prophets and other pious men in the Old Teſtament, declares, "that ſuch facts of an extraordinary kind, which were the immediate effects of a divine impulſe, are not recorded as examples of common practice, nor to be warranted in common men, unleſs ſpecially authoriſed in the ſame manner, as thoſe Prophets were." The caſe is the ſame with regard to the Apoſtles: the ſevere cenſures, which they ſometimes paſſed on Hæretics, and other wicked men, being the ſuggeſtions of a divine ſpirit, ought not to be drawn into precedent, but by the direction of the ſame ſpirit: for otherwiſe, the peace of the Church would neceſſarily be diſturbed by perpetual ſchiſms and quarrels, and it's beſt members, through the clamor and rage of a few zealots, often treated as the worſt. Every man's experience will furniſh inſtances, of the wretched fruits of this zeal, in the bigotted, vicious and ignorant part, both of the Clergy, and the Layety;

who puffed with the pride of an imaginary orthodoxy, and deteſting all free inquiry, as dangerous to their eaſe, and ſure to expoſe their ignorance, take pleaſure in defaming and inſulting men of learning, candor and probity, who happen to be touched with any ſcruples, or charged with any opinions, which they think fit to call Hæretical.

Taylor

The very learned and pious Biſhop *Tailor*, ſpeaking of this very ſtory, ſays; *it is a good precedent for us, when the caſe is equal. St. John could diſcern the ſpirit of Cerinthus*; *and his hæreſy was notorious, fundamental, and highly criminal*; *and the Apoſtle, a perſon aſſiſted up to infallibility.* It is this character then of Infallibility, which alone can warrant us in copying the pretended act of the Apoſtle; for unleſs we be poſſeſſed of this, the caſe can never be equal: and the ſole inference, which we can reaſonably draw in the mean time, from *St. John*'s behaviour towards *Cerinthus*, as well as towards the Thief, above mentioned, is; that by his power of diſcerning ſpirits, he knew the Hæretic to be a profligate and determined enemy of the Chriſtian faith; and the Thief, to be a good natured youth, who through the giddineſs of his age, and the contagion of bad company, had been drawn inconſiderately into a raſh and deſperate frolic. But to propoſe this caſe, as a teſt or ſtanding proof of the *ſuperior iniquity of Hæreſy, above the groſſeſt immorality*; of it's being more abominable than robbery, or in ſome caſes, as we are told [a], than even *felony or treaſon*, is certainly dangerous to ſociety; tending to turn men's heads with fanaticiſm; and to introduce violent and ſanguinary procedings in the affair of religious differences.

Harisy worse than Robbery or Treason.

Murthers Massacres

For what elſe is it, that has given birth to all thoſe murthers and maſſacres, which Hæretics have ſo often ſuffered in all thoſe countries, where this doctrine has ever prevailed, and to which they ſtand expoſed at this day, wherever it ſtill prevails? the effect is natural and unavoidable: for if robbery and treaſon be crimes ſo intolerable to ſociety, that it is neceſſary to puniſh them with death, it follows of courſe, that crimes, more odious ſtill both to God and man, muſt deſerve a ſeverer treatment; by the addition of racks, tortures and fires, which are all therefore actually applied in ſuch caſes, by every Chriſtian nation, perſuaded of the truth of this ſame principle.

---

[a] Import. of the Doctr. of the Trin. p. 218.

Racks and Fires.

Our Divines indeed take pains to diſclame the charge of Popiſh cruelty, and profeſs to mean nothing more, than the neceſſity *of ſpiritual cenſures.* They tell us, that piety to God, charity to man, juſtice to ourſelves require the exerciſe of ſuch cenſures: *that it is fervent charity, tho' expreſſed in an harſher way*; *ſince palliating medicines would be cruel, where corroſives are the onely means of cure* [a]. But all this is a mere fallacy, and the very cant of the Romiſh Inquiſitors; who make the ſame pretence of piety, charity, and juſtice, without a grain of them in any of their procedings, and in the very exerciſe of ſuch barbarities, as are ſhocking to humanity itſelf [b].

Inqusitors.

Dr. Waterland however ſays, *that Divines may ſtill deſire, that ſuch offenders may live to repent, rather than ſuffer death or civil penalties.* But what if they ſhould not repent? why then, *they periſh,* he ſays, *with their eyes open, and may take the blame to themſelves* [c]. And in truth, all ſpiritual juriſdiction, whether in Popiſh or Proteſtant hands, muſt of courſe terminate in civil penalties; ſince it would be contemptible without them, and unable to inforce it's own cenſures. But ſince civil puniſhments for ſpeculative opinions, if openly and profeſſedly clamed, might be ſhocking to a free nation, it is artful to evade that odium, by beginning at the other end, and to eſtabliſh the thing more ſecurely, by ſeeming to diſavow it. But it is certain, that there is very little difference between Proteſtant and Popiſh tyranny, if a liberty be not allowed to private judgement in all ſpeculative opinions, without reſtraint, or fear of puniſhment, on any other account, than of it's being exerciſed unſeaſonably and intemperately to the diſturbance of the ſtate.

---

[a] See Import. of the Doctr. of the Trin. p. 133.

[b] Sanctæ Inquiſitionis paternam curam —plenam charitatis inſtructionem. Ant. de Domin. Conſil. redit. p. 23.

[c] Ibid. p. 218, 219.

On the whole; it appears, I think, from what is ſaid above, 1ſt, that this hearſay-ſtory, concerning *St. John* and *Cerinthus*, is at the beſt of ſo uncertain and doubtfull a credit, that we cannot reaſonably lay any ſtreſs, or ground any point of duty upon it. 2dly, That if we ſhould grant it even to be true, it would be abſurd and dangerous to the peace of the Church, in it's preſent circumſtances, to eſtabliſh it as a rule of conduct, to private and ordinary Chriſtians.

ESSAY

ON THE

Allegorical and Literal INTERPRETATION

OF THE

CREATION and FALL of MAN.

ON

Allegorical Interpretation, *&c.*

IT is a principle conſtantly laid down by all the Expoſitors of Sacred Writ, that every part of it muſt be expounded in ſuch a manner, as to render it conſiſtent with reaſon, and the known attributes of the Deity; and whatever will not admit of that interpretation, cannot be received, as of divine authority. If this be true, it follows, that our notion of God and his Attributes is not to be drawn originally from the Scriptures, but from nature and reaſon, previouſly to our ſtudy of Scriptures, which otherwiſe would be apt to lead us into dangerous errors. *He who cometh to God,* ſays the Apoſtle, *muſt believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of thoſe, who diligently ſeek him* [*a*]. It would be abſurd, to make the divine Attributes, the rule of interpreting Scripture, and yet to take our notion of thoſe Attributes from the ſame Scripture: for that would confound the rule, with the thing to be tried by it: and like travelling in a circle, inſtead of carrying us forward, would bring us onely to the point, from which we ſet out. The want of attention to this maxim, and the raſhneſs of interpreting the Sacred books, without any juſt conception of the Deity, has given birth to all thoſe ſenſeleſs doctrines and Hæreſies which have diſturbed and diſgraced the Chriſtian Church in all ages.

The first Philosophy and Theology
not drawn from Scripture.

A Christian must first believe
in God and his Attributes.

For example; The litteral acceptation of *the Moſaic Hiſtory of the Creation and fall of man,* by it's ſeeming inconſiſtency, with

Creation and Fall.

[*a*] Heb. xi. 6.

R 2 the

2 Gods. 1 evil, the other good.

the characters of the divine wiſdom and goodneſs, induced certain Hæretics of the Primitive Church, to aſſert *the exiſtence of two Gods, or independent principles*; *the one evil*; *the Creator of the world, and God of the Old Teſtament*; *the other good*; *the ſupreme God and Father of Jeſus* [*a*]; while the ſame method of interpreting induced other *ſimpler Chriſtians* alſo, as *Origen* tells us, *who honored the Creator, and thought nothing ſuperior to him, to aſcribe ſuch things to him, as they would not believe of the moſt cruel and unjuſt of men* [*b*]. But neither thoſe early Hæretics, nor ſimple Chriſtians, could have fallen into ſuch groſs errors, if they had previouſly conceived and fixed in their minds, any rational notion of the nature of God. And in truth, there is not any part of the holy Scriptures, that has ſo much exerciſed the wit and invention of the Commentators, as this very Hiſtory of the Creation, by the difficulty of reconciling it to the allowed attributes of the Creator.

I ſhall not enter into a particular examination of all their various expoſitions: ſome of them will fall in our way in the courſe of this argument. All that I propoſe at preſent, is, to compare onely in general, the ſeveral merits of the two principal and rival kinds of interpretation, the one according to the Letter, the other to Allegory; which have each of them been approved and preferred in their turns, in different ages of the Church.

Letter
Allegory.

By the Letter, I mean the Hiſtorical acceptation of the text, as a plain narrative of facts, ſuppoſed to have been tranſacted in the very manner and order, in which they are there related: by Allegory, I mean that latent and more refined way of delivering truth, under the dreſs of fiction, or fable, which was practiſed chiefly in antient times, and by the Sages of the Eaſtern world.

Clemens.

Clemens of *Alexandria*, one of the moſt learned and inquiſitive of all the Primitive Fathers, declares, "that all, who treat of "Theology, whether Greeks or Barbarians, have ever induſtri-

---

[*a*] Iren. l. 1. c. 28, 29. Origen. Præſcr. Hæret. 40. Philocal. c. 1. p. 6, 7, 21. Tertull. [*b*] Orig. ibid. p. 7.

“ ouſly involved the beginnings of things, by delivering the truth
“ in *ænigmas, ſymbols, and allegories.* That this *ſymbolical* man-
“ ner of inſtruction was in particular eſteem with the *Hebrews* as
“ well as the *Ægyptians*, and that the *Greeks* borrowed it from
“ *Moſes.* That truth under this veil of allegory carries a more
“ awfull and majeſtic form. And that this kind of interpreta-
“ tion was of all others the moſt uſefull to true Theology, and
“ piety, and the ſure proof of a ſuperior wiſdom and under-
“ ſtanding [1].

Ænigmas, Symbols, and Allegories of Hebrews Ægyptians and Greeks.

Euſebius obſerves, “ that the *Jews* were of two ſorts, the
“ learned and unlearned: that the latter of theſe, or the multi-
“ tude, were ſubjected by *Moſes* to the litteral obſervation of his
“ laws, as delivered in words: but the men of ſtronger minds
“ were freed from that ſubjection, and trained to a more divine
“ philoſophy, and to penetrate into the hidden meaning. Agree-
“ ably to which diſtinction, he ſays; that they had public readers
“ or Interpreters called *Deuterotæ*, who explaned the recondite
“ and ænigmatical ſenſe, not promiſcuouſly to all, but to ſuch
“ onely, as were qualified to receive it.” All which he confirms by the authority of *Philo* and *Ariſtobulus*, and the conſtant practice of the *Eſſenes*, who followed this figurative manner of expounding, which, even in thoſe days, was called antient [2].

Euſebius.

Deuterotæ.

Philo. Aristobulus, Essenes.

On the other hand, it is certain, that the litteral interpretation of the firſt chapters of *Geneſis*, has been a perpetual ſource of doubts and difficulties to the beſt Commentators; and of raillery and ridicule to the enemies of reveled religion in all ages. *Celſus*, the old adverſary of the Goſpel, laughs at the ſtory *of Adam's formation, and of Eve made from his rib; of God's commands to them both; and of the Serpent oppoſing and eluding the effect of thoſe commands*, as an abſurd old woman's tale: where *Origen*, in anſwer to him, obſerves, *that he does not act fairly, but diſſembles,*

Celsus.

Origen

---

[1] Stromat. l. 5. p. 658, 670, 673, 679. it. l. 2. 429. &c. Edit. Oxon.

[2] Præpar. Evangel. l. 8. x, xi. it. l. xi. v. This *Ariſtobulus* is ſuppoſed to be the ſame perſon, who is praiſed in the 2d book of the *Maccabees.* c. 1. x.

what he ought to have ſignified, that all this was to be underſtood in an allegorical ſenſe; not giving his reader the words themſelves, which would have put him in mind, that they were ſpoken figuratively. Yet *Celſus* himſelf owns on another occaſion, *that the reaſonable and moderate both of the Jews and Chriſtians were aſhamed of theſe ſtories, and endeavoured to turn them into an Allegory* [1].

Origen

Hesiod, Plato

Clemens. Julian

Origen retorts likewiſe his own cavils upon him, by ſhewing "that there were much ſillier ſtories among their own writers, "both Poets, and Philoſophers, of which he gives ſeveral in- "ſtances from *Heſiod and Plato*, which were all allegorized by "their interpreters to a moral ſenſe; and he urges it as unreaſon- "able, to deny to the Jews, and to their Legiſlator *Moſes*, what "was allowed to all other nations; *the poſſeſſion of truth under* "*the veil of myſtery* [2]:" in which reaſoning he purſued the principles of his maſter *Clemens*. *Julian* alſo, after rallying, as *Celſus* had done, the particular articles of the ſame ſtory, ſays; *that unleſs it be conſidered as a fable, of a ſecret and myſtical ſenſe, it is full of great blaſphemies againſt God* [3].

Eusebius.

Cyril

It is commonly objected by the Naturaliſts, that the *Moſaic* account of the creation, if conſidered onely according to the letter, cannot poſſibly be reconciled to phyſical truth, or to the nature of things. *Euſebius* ſays in excuſe for it, *that it was not Moſes's intention, to give a philoſophical account of the formation of the world, but to ſignify onely, that it did not exiſt of itſelf or by chance, but was the production of an all wiſe and all powerfull Creator* [4]. *Cyril* makes the ſame reply to the ſcoffs of *Julian*, *that Moſes's view was, to accommodate his ſtory to the ignorance of the Jews; not to reaſon accurately on the origin of things, but to ſhew, that there was one God, who created them all* [5]. Others, who contend for the neceſſity of allegory, are more ſevere upon the litteral meaning.

Philo

Philo calls it a *piece of ruſtic ſimplicity to imagine, that God really*

---

[1] Cont. Celſ. p. 186, 187.

[2] Cont. Celſ. l. 4. p. 189.

[3] Julian Oper. & Cyrill. contr. Vol. 2. l. 3. p. 93, 94. Ed. Lipſ.

[4] Præpar. Evangel. l. 2. 7.

[5] Vid. Julian Oper. ibid. p. 50.

employed the labor of ſix days in the production of things [1]*:* in which he is followed by *Origen*, *Auſtin*, *Ambroſe*, &c. “ What “ man in his ſenſes, ſays *Origen*, will believe, that the firſt, 2d “ and 3d days, and the evenings and mornings paſſed without “ ſun, moon, and ſtars? and the firſt even without the heavens? “ who ſo ſilly as to think, that God, like an Huſbandman, “ planted a garden, and in it a real tree of life, to be taſted by “ corporeal teeth; or that the knowledge of good and ill was to “ be acquired by eating the fruit of another tree? and as to God's “ walking in that garden and *Adam*'s hiding himſelf from him “ among the trees, he ſays; no man can doubt but that theſe “ things are to be taken figuratively, and not litterally; to denote “ certain myſteries or recondite ſenſes.

Origen, Austin Ambrose

Bravo!

Figuratively.

He contends alſo, that in ſome parts of the *Moſaic* hiſtory, “ there are interſperſed certain abſurdities or impoſſibilities, on “ purpoſe, to draw us away from the mere pleaſure of the narra- “ tion, leſt by finding nothing in it worthy of God, we might “ apoſtatize from the true doctrine, and being unmoved by the “ letter, learn nothing divine from it [2].

Absurdities and Impossibilities in the Mosaick History.

It would be tedious to collect the ſtrange variety of conceits, which have been invented, about the ſingle article of a Paradiſe. One main argument againſt the reality of it, is, the ignorance, in which all ages have been concerning it's place and ſituation. It's being guarded ſo ſtrictly by a *Cherubim and flaming ſword*, if it be underſtood litterally, neceſſarily implies, that after the expulſion of *Adam*, it was acceſſible ſtill to man. Yet if it had actually ſubſiſted in any part of the Eaſtern world, it is hard to conceive, why from the time of *Adam*'s expulſion, there ſhould not be the leaſt mention of it's place or ſituation, in the records of thoſe Antediluvian ages: ſince *Adam* himſelf was not probably far removed from it; and his poſterity at leaſt, upon their increaſe and diſperſion from each other, muſt needs have been planted and ſettled on all ſides of it.

The Place of Paradise not known.

---

[1] Vid. Sixt. Senenſ. Biblioth. l. 5. p. 338.

[2] Orig. Philocal. c. 1. p. 12, 13.

The Deluge might destroy it,

Brandanus a Briton ſailed round the World in ſearch of it.

Enoch Elias and Paul translated or caught up to it, in the 3d Heavens, wh Irenaus affirms to have been taught by the Apostles and delivered to him by those antient Men who had been their Disciples.

After the deluge indeed, and the univerſal change, which is ſuppoſed to have been made by it on the ſurface of the earth, it is not ſtrange, that it's place and remains could not any where be diſcovered, notwithſtanding all the pains, inquiries and even voyages of the curious in queſt of it: among whom I find none ſo adventurous, as an Abbot of our own Iſland, named *Brandanus*, who is celebrated in Monkiſh ſtory, for ſailing round the world in ſearch of it [1]. Yet it is certain, that it could never have been in any part of this terreſtrial globe, if what the Primitive Fathers declare concerning it be true, that it was the place, *into which Enoch and Elias were tranſlated, and into which, St. Paul alſo was caught up, in the third heaven:* which *Irenæus* affirms, *to have been taught by the Apoſtles, and delivered to him by thoſe antient men, who had been their diſciples* [2].

But there is not a ſingle article of this narrative of the Creation, which, in it's litteral ſenſe, has not puzzled all the expoſitors, and furniſhed the Sceptics with perpetual topics of ridicule. In anſwer to whom, I have never met with one advocate of the letter, either antient or modern, who has ventured to affirm the whole to be rational and natural; or has not been forced to take ſhelter under Allegory, in one part of it or the other.

Joſephus.

Joſephus, in the Præface of his Jewiſh Antiquities, tells us, "that their Legiſlator *Moſes* had dexterouſly involved ſome things "in ænigma's, delivered others with dignity in Allegories, and litterally explaned, whatever was proper to be directly propoſed: "which to thoſe, who are diſpoſed to ſearch into the cauſes of "each, will afford much contemplation, and of a kind truly "philoſophical. That the purpoſe of his Antiquities was, to "ſet forth onely the litteral and hiſtorical part; but if God prolonged his life, he would endeavour to explane the other parts "alſo." And in the firſt chapter of his book, he clearly ſignifies, "that the ſtory of the Creation was of the allegoric kind: "for after a brief abſtract of the firſt day's work, given in the

---

[1] Chytr. Onomaſtic. Bibl. p. 798.

[2] Iren. l. 5. c. 5. p. 405. vid. Not. 4.

"words of *Moſes*, he adds; I could now explane the cauſe of this, but ſince I have promiſed to give the cauſes of all in a ſeparate volume, I will defer the interpretation of it to that time [1]."

Philo actually performed, what *Joſephus* promiſed; and has largely explaned all the allegories of the Moſaic law; and in a particular treatiſe *on the formation of the World, according to Moſes*'s account of it, he ſays; "theſe are not fabulous tales, ſuch as the poetic and ſophiſtic tribe delight in, but figurative deſcriptions, leading us to allegorical and recondite ſenſes; to which if any one rightly and rationally attends, he will aptly call the ſerpent the emblem of pleaſure. Firſt, becauſe, being without feet, he lays his whole ſtreſs upon his belly: 2dly, becauſe he makes the clods of earth his food: 3dly, becauſe he carries poiſon in his teeth, which deſtroys all who are bit by him: all which noxious qualities belong alſo to the voluptuous man [2]."

Philo.

Not Arabian Tales.
but moral Fables.

Serpent, Pleasure

St. Auſtin, in the preface to his twelve books, of *the litteral interpretation* of the three firſt chapters of *Geneſis*, ſays; "the quæſtion is, whether all theſe things are to be underſtood onely in a figurative ſenſe, or to be embraced and defended by the rule of hiſtorical faith, as things, which were really tranſacted. For that they are not to be underſtood figuratively, no Chriſtian will dare to ſay; who recollects, that the Apoſtle declares, *how all thoſe things happened to them in a figure*, and recommends that, which is written in *Geneſis*, *theſe two ſhall be one fleſh*, as a great myſtery, relating to Chriſt and the Church [3]. On the ſubject of *Paradiſe* alſo, he tells us, "that there were three opinions about it, which were in a manner general: One, of thoſe, who interpreted it, of a corporeal or material *Paradiſe*: another, of thoſe, who underſtood it onely, of a ſpiritual one:

Austin.

A Figure.

Material

Spiritual.

---

[1] Vid. Antiqu. Jud. Prooem. & c. 1. p. 5. Edit. Haverc.

[2] De Opific. Mundi Secund. Moyſ. Op. T. 1. p. 38. Ed. Lond.

[3] Nam non eſſe accipienda figuraliter, nullus Chriſtianus dicere audebit &c. De Geneſ. ad litteram. l. 1. c. 1.

Both.

" and a third, of thoſe, who conſidered it in both thoſe ſenſes; " ſometimes in a corporeal and ſometimes in a ſpiritual: and this " third opinion, he ſays: was that which pleaſed him [1]." Wherefore, after he had given the allegorical interpretation in another part of his writings, he profeſſes in theſe twelve books, to explane the ſame things, according to their hiſtorical truth; yet even here, is frequently driven back again to Allegory, or as oft as he found himſelf unable, he ſays, *to accommodate the text to a proper and litteral ſenſe* [2].

Double Interpretations.

But this double way of interpreting, which *Auſtin* here approves, and the Moderns generally follow, by conſidering one ſentence as litteral; the next, as allegorical; one part as a fact, the next as a fable; ſeems to be abſurd and irrational; tending rather to confound, than inlighten the underſtandings of men; and was contrived without doubt for no other purpoſe, but the ſupport of ſyſtems and prejudices, which plain ſcripture would not juſtify, till it was dreſſed up and ſeaſoned as it were, by a mixture of ſenſes which did not belong to it. Fables indeed may be grounded on things real and true: and a general notion of ſuch truths may be artfully conveyed under the veil of fiction or Allegory: but hiſtorical and allegorical narrations are compoſitions of quite different kinds, and ſerving to different ends: the one to repreſent, by a litteral deſcription, the true and natural ſtate of things; the other, to inculcate ſome hidden truth, quite different from what it litterally repreſents. It ſeems impoſſible therefore, that two ſuch oppoſite characters, which naturally deſtroy each other, can belong to the ſame ſubject; or that one and the ſame deſcription can, by any art or mixture of ſenſes, be rendered both truly hiſtorical and allegorical at the ſame time.

---

[1] Tres tamen de hac re quaſi generales ſunt ſententiæ &c. ibid. l. 8. c. 1.

[2] Et quia non mihi tunc occurrebant omnia, quemadmodum proprie poſſent accipi, magiſque non poſſe accipi videbantur, aut vix poſſe, aut difficile; &c— ib. l. 8. c. 2.

Tota iſta ſententia figurata eſt. ib. l. 13. c. 36.

Hæc quoque in mulierem verba Dei, figurate & prophetice multo commodius intelliguntur. ib. c. 37.

From theſe authorities and reflections, I have ever been inclined to conſider the particular ſtory of *the fall of man,* as a moral fable or allegory; ſuch as we frequently meet with in other parts, both of the old and new Teſtament, in which certain religious duties and doctrines, with the genuin nature and effects of them, are repreſented as it were to our ſenſes, by a fiction of perſons and facts, which had no real exiſtence. And I am the more readily induced to eſpouſe this ſenſe of it, from a perſuaſion, that it is not onely the moſt probable and rational, but the moſt uſeful alſo to the defence of our religion, by clearing it of thoſe difficulties, which are apt to ſhock and make us ſtumble as it were, at the very threſhold.

Fall, a moral Fable, like Æsop. Phedrus, La Fontaine Gay or More.

For whether we interpret the ſtory litterally or allegorically, I take it to be exactly the ſame, with regard to it's effects and influence on Chriſtianity; which requires nothing more from it, than what is taught by both the kinds of interpretation, *that this world had a beginning and creation from God; and that it's principal inhabitant man, was originally formed to a ſtate of happineſs and perfection which he loſt and forfeited, by following his luſts and paſſions, in oppoſition to the will of his Creator.* For there could not be any religion at all, without the belief of ſuch a Creator, nor any need of a reveled religion, but upon the ſuppoſition of man's fall. Theſe two points then, as the antients obſerved, are all, that *Moſes* propoſed to deliver to us; and they are delivered with equal truth and efficacy, either in the litteral or the allegorical way: nor do I find any reference to them in the ſacred Scriptures, which appears to be inconſiſtent with the allegorical acceptation of them.

The World created; not eternal.

Man, fallen from Happiness by gratifying his appetites.

No need of Revelation without Degeneracy from the first Philosophy.

Have ye not read, ſays our Saviour to the *Phariſees, that he, who made them at the beginning, made them male and female? and for this cauſe ſhall a man leave his Father and mother, and cleave to his wife; and they twain ſhall be one fleſh* [1]. He takes no notice of the particular manner of *Eve*'s formation, from the rib of *Adam*;

---

[1] Matt. xix. 4. Marc. x. 6.

but intimates onely in general the fact of their creation and the moral of it, which is equally deducible from the litteral and the allegorical ſenſe. *St. Paul* ſeems to allude indeed to the circumſtance of the rib, where he ſays, *that the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man: and that Adam was firſt formed, and then Eve:* [2] whence he infers the ſubordination of the female Sex. But his argument, whether it be drawn from the letter or the allegory, would have the ſame force, ſince it is ſuppoſed, that the allegory itſelf was contrived for the purpoſe, of ſuggeſting the ſame inference. Again, *I fear,* ſays *Paul to the Corinthians, leſt, as the ſerpent beguiled Eve, through his ſubtilty, ſo your minds ſhould be corrupted from the ſimplicity, that is in Chriſt.* [3] Where he ſeems to unfold the true meaning and hidden ſenſe of the *Moſaic* parable, and to ſignify, that *Eve* was beguiled and ſeduced from her native ſimplicity, by the carnality of her luſts and affections. For as that was certainly the caſe of the *Corinthians,* ſo the Apoſtle's ſimile would not be pertinent, unleſs we take the ſerpent, as many of the learned have done, to be the *ſymbol of luſt and ſenſual pleaſure.*

The Serpent, Pleasure.

Job a Drama
Providence
Patience
Submiſsion.

The book of *Job,* according to the moſt probable opinion, is nothing elſe, but a kind of *Fable* or *Poetic Drama*; deſigned to inculcate the certainty of a divine Providence; the duty of patience in afflictions, and of ſubmiſſion to the will of God under all his diſpenſations, how ſevere or afflicting ſoever they may happen to be. This was the ſenſe of the moſt antient and learned *Jews*; who had no clear account or probable tradition concerning either *Job* himſelf, or the author of the book: which ſome impute to *Moſes*; ſome to *David*; ſome to *Iſaiah,* or to one of the later Prophets; while others ſuppoſe it to have been written after *the Babyloniſh captivity:* Yet all of them ſeem to think, that *Job* himſelf, if ſuch a man ever really exiſted, muſt have lived in the times of the Patriarchs, But be that as it will, it is evident, that every part of the book breaths a dramatic and fabulous air: *the council of Angels convoked by God*; *the appearance of Satan among them*; *his debate with God, and commiſſion received from him*; *the ſeveral ſpeeches of Job and his friends*; the concluſion of the whole, by the apparition of God himſelf in a whirlwind; and all this, as the critics obſerve, delivered in verſe, make it highly probable or certain rather, that it was intended, as I have ſaid, for an inſtructive or *moral Drama*. Yet we find it referred to, and applied by *Ezechiel and St. James*, in the ſame manner as if it were a real hiſtory [1]; becauſe it's moral or doctrinal part could not fail to have the ſame effect in the one way, as in the other.

---

[2] 1. Cor. xi. 8.

[3] 2 Cor. xi. 3.

Counsel of Angels
Satan. debate. Commiſsion
Speeches.
Whirlwind.

Quoted by Ezchiel and James.

I cannot however omit one argument for the reality of it's hiſtoric character, which was wanting, as I obſerved above, to the caſe of Paradiſe. For tho' the place of Paradiſe could never be diſcovered in any age, by the moſt laborious ſearches of the curious, yet *St. Chryſoſtom* aſſured us, "that it was common in his "days to undertake dangerous voyages by ſea, from the remoteſt parts of the earth, *to viſit Job's dunghill in Arabia*, and upon "ſight of it, to kiſs the ground, which that holy champion had "ſtained with the blood of his ulcers, more precious than any "gold; and from which they received, he ſays, infinite benefit, "and much philoſophical inſtruction [2]."

Chryſostom.

Pilgramages to Jobs dung-
hill in Arabia.

The caſe is the ſame with the parables of our Saviour. For example; the parable of *Dives and Lazarus*, is delivered in ſo lively and affecting a manner, as to have given riſe to a diſpute, both among the antients and the moderns, whether it be a fable or true hiſtory, or mixed and compounded of them both [3]. But in what way ſoever it be taken, it yields the very ſame fruit to us: and all the interpreters, from the time of it's publication to this day, have been drawing from it, as from a real hiſtory, many excellent leſſons both of faith and practice. *St. Chryſoſtom*, in

Dives & Lazarus.

Chryſooſtom.

---

[1] Ezech. xiv. 14. Epiſt. Jam. v. 11.

[2] Chryſoſt. Oper. T. 2. p. 59. Edit. Benedict.

[3] Non autem fabulam retulit nobis pauperis & divitis. Sed primum quidem docuit, neminem oportere deliciis uti. &c. Iren. l. 4. c. 3. Vid. Not. 2.

four ſeveral Homilies, harangues upon it, as a perpetual ſource of inſtruction to all conditions of men; and tho' he treats it as a proper parable, yet he makes this reflection on the whole, *that advice and admonition have the ſureſt effect, when we ſee the riotous chaſtiſed and puniſhed not in words onely, but in fact and reality* [1].

Ænigma the Vehicle of Sages.

Ægyptians, Masters of Moses; and fond of Hieroglyphics.

To conclude, ſince it is allowed to have been the practice of all the ſages of the antient world, in treating of the origin of things, and the ſublime doctrines of theology, to wrap up what they delivered, under the veil of *Ænigmas*, *Symbols*, and *Allegories*; and ſince this was more peculiarly the cuſtom of *the Ægyptians*, among whom *Moſes* was born, and diligently trained *in all the myſterious parts of their learning and wiſdom*; it is reaſonable to imagine, that on the ſubject of the Creation, and the origin of man, he ſhould uſe a manner of writing, which all other nations then uſed, and which his maſters *the Ægyptians* had particularly taught him. This, I ſay, is what we ſhould previouſly expect from ſuch a writer, on ſuch a ſubject; and this is what we find him to have actually performed; as it is evident, as well from the turn and manner of his writing, as from the teſtimony of thoſe very people, for whoſe inſtruction he wrote; who generally treat theſe firſt chapters of *Geneſis* as allegorical, and are ſaid, to have reſtrained their youth from reading them on account of the difficulties of the litteral ſenſe, and the wrong notions, which it might imprint of God, till they had reached a maturity of age and judgement, which might qualify them to comprehend it's more recondite meaning. The Chriſtians, alſo, when they received theſe books from the *Jews*, received from them at the ſame time, this ſame method of expounding, which they univerſally followed in the primitive ages: and on the authority of ſuch guides, it cannot ſurely be thought raſh, or give any juſt ſcandal, to adhere to the ſame interpretation; eſpecially, ſince it will be found, as I have ſaid above, the moſt effectual of all others, to clear our religion from thoſe objections, which in all ages have ſhocked the faith of many, on their very entrance into it.

Jews and Christians expounded them alike.

---

[1] Chryſoſt. T. 1. 719.

A LETTER

A
LETTER
TO
Dr. *WATERLAND*;

Containing ſome REMARKS on his

Vindication of Scripture:

In Anſwer to a BOOK, intituled,

Chriſtianity as old as the Creation,

Together with

The SKETCH or PLAN

OF

Another Anſwer to the ſaid BOOK.

A
LETTER
TO
Dr. *WATERLAND.*

SIR,

I HAVE lately read a *Piece of yours*, called, *Scripture Vindicated, in anſwer to a Book, intituled, Chriſtianity as old as the Creation.* I ſat down to it, I confeſs, with ſome kind of eagerneſs; expecting from the great reputation of your name, as well as the great importance of the ſubject, to find in it ſomething ſolid and convincing, anſwerable to the difficulty of the taſk you had undertaken, of reconciling *all the exceptionable paſſages of Scripture* to reaſon and morality.

But I had not entered far, before I perceived the vanity of my expectation, and foreſaw the diſappointment I was like to ſuffer in my hopes of entertainment and ſatisfaction from a work, which partly from its own nature, but eſpecially from your method of handling it, ſeems calculated rather to raiſe *new ſcruples*, than to quiet *old ones*; and to expoſe the *Scripture you are vindicating* to freſh ridicule and contempt, than to convince either the *Author* you have to deal with, or any others of *ſceptical* and *unſettled* minds: the reaſons of which opinion I ſhall without further preface or ceremony proceed to explain to you very freely.

Your *Introduction* begins by opening to us the deſign of the *Author* you are confuting; telling us, that *his book is a declamatory libel againſt revealed Religion, under colour of ſetting up natural Religion in its place*; that he diſcovers in it *two principal ends*; *the one, to vilify the holy Scripture*; *the other, to magnify the law of Nature:* In the firſt, you own he deals *frankly and from his heart*; in the latter, you charge him with hypocriſy and diſſimulation; aſſuring us, that all he ſays is *but flam*, and that in reality he is no more a friend *to Natural Religion than he is to Revealed.*

This you ſupport by declaring that *Natural Religion is ſo bound up in Revealed, that they cannot ſubſiſt ſeparately*; *muſt ſtand or fall together*; and conſequently, *if he had been a friend to one, it is not conceivable how he could be an adverſary to the other.*

But this, Sir, I'm afraid, will make but little impreſſion on your adverſary; will paſs with him for *meer begging the queſtion*; meer words without weight or conſequence; or what's ſtill worſe, will, when examined, be found to be falſe: for had not *Natural Religion* a ſubſiſtence before *Chriſtianity* was ever known to the world? and did not many by its ſole influence attain to ſuch an exalted degree of virtue, as few or none have ever ſince arrived at? and at this very day in *Mahometan and Idolatrous Nations*, where *Chriſtianity* has no influence, is it not neceſſary to imagine, that there are many, who by the meer *light of Reaſon* ſee thro' the cheat of the *popular Religion*, and by its help form to themſelves ſome other more rational rule of life and manners; and laſtly, in our own as well as other *Chriſtian* countries, however *inconceivable* it may be to you, yet all who know any thing of the world, will eaſily *conceive*, and actually find it a very common caſe, to meet with men who with little or no regard for *Revealed Religion*, yet expreſs both by words and actions a great reverence for *Natural*; of which number *your Author*, for any thing I know, or you have ſaid to the contrary, may poſſibly be one: for ſince in every part of his work he profeſſes a very *high notion* of the excellency of *Reaſon*, *Truth and Virtue*; profeſſes to believe *a God*, *a Providence*, *a future ſtate*; both reaſon and charity oblige us to look upon him as ſincere, till we are forced to think otherwiſe by ſome particular knowledge or information of his real life and character.

But no thanks, you tell us, are due, to perſons for commending *Virtue, which all the world admires, and envy itſelf muſt praiſe, and which even its enemies are forced to pay a reverence and veneration to.* Now is not this a little inconſiſtent, to charge men with a deſign to overthrow what themſelves, and all the world beſides, muſt neceſſarily admire and pay a veneration to? and tho' their reverence, as you ſay, is but an *aukward one*, and what they are forced to againſt their wills; yet is it poſſible to entertain a thought of deſtroying what the *nature and neceſſity of things* force them to reverence? What you mean by an *aukward reverence*, I don't well underſtand; but am certain, that if *aukwardneſs* be a mark of inſincerity, then *Orthodoxy* muſt needs be undone, ſince I know none who pay *their reverence ſo aukwardly* as ſome of its principal champions.

You next explain the purpoſe of your own work; deſigned, you ſay, *to reſcue the word of God from miſrepreſentation and cenſure; from the reproaches and blaſphemies of fooliſh men:* and 'tis matter of *melancholy conſideration to* You, *that there ſhould be found men ſo abandoned and profligate, as to ſhut their eyes againſt light; affront God to his face; take a pride in throwing him back his favours.* But how melancholy ſoever this conſideration may be, we ought not ſtill, it ſeems, to be *ſhocked or ſcandalized* at it, for two reaſons. Firſt, becauſe it was propheſied, *that there ſhould come ſcoffers in the laſt days*; yet all the inſtances you give are of ſuch as came in the *firſt days.* Secondly, becauſe *it is certainly known with what views, and upon what motives they do it*, being all *an abandoned and profligate ſet of men; taking a pride in affronting God to his face; whoſe affections are corrupt, whoſe deeds evil; the ſecret of whoſe counſels is to ſteel mens hearts againſt a judgment to come, and lead them blindfold into Hell; whoſe real and onely aim is to reduce the laws of God to the luſts and paſſions of men; to ſhake off all religious reſtraints, that they may be at liberty to follow their pleaſures*, &c.

But this, good Doctor, to ſpeak freely, is not *reaſoning* but *railing*; or, to uſe your own words [a], *ſhews more of a diſpoſition to revile, than to argue and debate*; and till 'tis ſupported by facts and proofs ſufficient to convince men of ſenſe, will always paſs with ſuch for *the crude and ſenſeleſs cant of Bigots*, the commonplace ſtuff of declamatory Preachers: for every man, who has practiſed the world, and uſed the converſation of men of letters, muſt needs have met with many perſons of much ſeeming honor, virtue, and ſobriety of life, who partly *profeſs to have ſcruples*, partly an *entire diſbelief of all Revelation:* and what way, think you, is the moſt likely to convince men of this character? Is it poſſible to work any good upon them by the method you here take; by telling them that they are *profligate and abandoned*, *contemners of God*, *and enemies to Man?* Is not ſuch treatment ſure to have a contrary effect? and being conſcious to themſelves, that your charge upon them is both *falſe and malicious*, inſtead of conſidering *your book*, as *a charitable attempt* to recover a ſoul from ruin, they will reject it with ſcorn, as an *infamous and ſcandalous libel.*

After this general charge on all who *cavil at Scripture*, you deſcend to fix it more particularly on the *Author* you have to do with: this you do, firſt, by citing *two paſſages* from *ſome private letters*, as you call them; ſignifying that the intention of the writer of them was *to ſave a ſoul from the diſmal apprehenſions of eternal damnation*; or *from the uneaſineſs of mind which he is often under when pleaſure and Chriſtianity come in competition.* What *Letters* theſe are I know not, but preſume, that you have reaſon to know the *Author of them* to be the *Author* likewiſe *of the book* you are confuting; or elſe with what ſenſe or juſtice can you impute to *one man* what *another* has ſaid or written? but you add immediately, *this is the noble and generous aim which the Writer I am concerned with boaſts of in his Preface.* This indeed is charging him home with the *ſame ſentiments*; if he not onely avows them, but *boaſts of them:* for who could collect or imagine any thing leſs from your words? but I was much ſurprized, when conſulting his *Preface* on the occaſion, I could not find a ſyllable of the *letters or paſſages* juſt mentioned, nor any ſentiments at all like them, but the mention onely of a *noble and generous deſign*, in having, as he imagined, contrived rules to diſtinguiſh between *Religion and Superſtition.* Such a diſingenuous way of forming an indictment muſt needs appear odious not onely to the *enemies*, but much more to the *friends* of a Religion, which prohibits ſo ſeverely all *raſh cenſure*; preſcribes the *utmoſt candour and charity* towards all men, and will not bear a *railing accuſation* even againſt the *Devil* himſelf.

---

[a] P. 67.

From charging him with *other peoples* ſentiments, you come at laſt to convict him by *his own*: telling us, that *he gives broad hints in one place, that he looks upon incontinence in ſingle perſons as one of the rights allowed by the Law of Nature.* If by *incontinence* he means, what you ſeem to ſuppoſe, the *cohabiting of ſingle perſons of each ſex for the propagation of the ſpecies, without the intervention of a Prieſt, or any other formality but mutual conſent*; had his *hints* been ſtill *broader*, they are but agreeable to the principles he maintains; nor will he find much difficulty in defending them by the *Laws of Reaſon and Nature*; and I wonder how from ſuch *hints* you can ground any imputation of *immorality* upon one, who is reaſoning from thoſe principles, from which your ſelf muſt be forced to allow ſtill a greater licence; not onely *a plurality of wives*, but a *number of concubines* into the bargain; unleſs you will give up ſome part at leaſt of the Scripture you are vindicating, and condemn the *holy Patriarchs, Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob*; and above all, *David, the man after God's own heart*; who had at leaſt *ſeven wives*, and *ten concubines*, without ever being admoniſhed for it by any of the *Prophets*, or cenſured by any of the *ſacred Writers*. So that here he will probably turn your own reaſoning upon you; that it is *a weak thing of you, to charge the Law of Nature as not ſtrict enough, when your own Scripture appears to be looſer* [a].

---

[a] P. 90.

Again; you charge him with *declaring flatly and plainly againſt our Lord's doctrine of loving thoſe that hate us:* Yet in the place you refer to, I find him arguing onely, that thoſe words are not to be taken in their *ſtrict and literal* ſenſe, but like *many other texts* of the ſame nature, which he there enumerates, viz. *he that takes away thy coat, let him have thy cloak alſo: of him who takes thy goods, aſk them not again: whoever ſhall ſmite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other alſo,* &c. muſt be interpreted agreeably to the *reaſon and nature of things,* and the *common good of ſociety*; and that to practiſe them in their *obvious and grammatical* ſenſe would occaſion much miſchief to the public, much injuſtice to particular men: In all which, as he ſays nothing more than what *all Commentators* and *all rational Chriſtians* allow, I cannot think it reaſonable, from this inſtance, to charge him with ſeeking to *relax the Laws of Chriſt, to make them ſuit the better with corrupt Nature.*

But had he furniſhed no direct proofs of the *malice* you impute to him, yet your penetration, it ſeems, is ſuch, as can ſee to the *very bottom* of him; for tho' he *ſtudiouſly,* as you ſay, *diſguiſes himſelf, and takes great pains to put fair gloſſes on what he is doing, yet ſometimes he diſcovers the very ſecrets of his heart:* and tho' in the ſame page you allow, that *he himſelf beſt knows how far he is influenced by luſt and malice*; yet in the very next words you recollect your ſelf, and ſignify, that you know as well as himſelf, and that *'tis eaſy to perceive how much the black paſſions have got the aſcendant over him.*

The concluſion of *your Introduction* is of a piece with the reſt: for after declaiming againſt his wickedneſs, you conclude by contemning his learning and abilities. *His attacks,* you ſay, *are feeble, his artillery contemptible: he has no genius or taſte for literature; no acquaintance with the original languages; nor ſo much as with common Criticks and Commentators: ſeveral of his objections are pure* Engliſh *objections; ſuch as affect onely our tranſlation: the reſt are of the loweſt and moſt trifling ſort,* &c. And in the body of your book you go ſtill farther, and treat him with the plain terms of *Fool and Idiot*; as having neither *wit*, *judgment*, *learning*, *or any thing but dull malice* [a].

If this be really the caſe, what is *all this buſtle* about? Why all this *apparatus* to foil ſo *feeble*, *ſo contemptible an adverſary?* Why muſt you be called off from the great work of defending *Creeds and Poſitive Precepts*, to contend with ſuch a *trifler?* Why muſt *two eminent ſcholars* be picked out from *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, to divide the taſk between them, and repel with united force the *deſpicable attacks of a pure* Engliſh *blunderer?* All *this apparatus*, I ſay, muſt needs perſuade us, that you have a different notion of *his ability*, from what you think proper to declare: and, in fact, as all who talk extravagantly or inſincerely are apt to betray themſelves, ſo you in many places confute your ſelf, and ſhew that theſe *pure Engliſh objections*, which owe their riſe, as you would inſinuate, to the *blunders of our Tranſlation*, deſerve to be conſidered in another light; ſince at ſome times you exclaim againſt them as being *ſtale*, or *borrowed from Antiquity*; from the ancient enemies of Religion, *Celſus* and *Julian*; at other times, from our learned moderns, *Marſham* and *Burnet*, *&c.* [b] and do not ſo much as in one ſingle inſtance prove them to be grounded on the *miſtaken ſenſe* of the original.

For my own part, to obſerve our *Engliſh proverb*, and *give even the Devil his due*, I cannot for my life diſcover any ſuch want *of literature* as you object to *him*; but on the contrary, ſee plainly that his work has been the effect of *much ſtudy and reading*; his materials collected from a great variety of the *beſt Writers*; his pages decently *crowded with citations*; and his *Index of Authors as numerous*, as that of moſt books which have lately appeared: and to tell you the truth, were it my taſk to anſwer him in the method you have choſen, by undertaking *to vindicate every ſingle text of Scripture from all the exceptions that may be made to it*, I ſhould be tempted to wiſh that he had ſtill *leſs learning*, rather than *more*; ſince with the ſmall ſhare he has, one may eaſily foreſee by the ſpecimen you give us, that he will in many caſes be at leaſt a full match for you.

---

[a] P. 31, 95.

[b] P. 27, 28, 55.

Thus much, Sir, for *your Introduction*; which, if it appears to others in the ſame light, as it did to me, will afford them but little hopes of pleaſure or edification in what is to follow; but like foul weather at ſetting out, give a diſcouraging proſpect of the dirt they are to travel thro' in the reſt of their journey.

Let's now proceed to examine the work itſelf; wherein you undertake to *vindicate the moſt exceptionable texts of Scripture from cavil and cenſure:* This, Sir, is a hardy undertaking, and what few few men of modeſty or prudence would venture upon; ſince however it may be diſcharged, 'tis likely, as I've ſaid above, from the nature of the ſubject itſelf, to do *hurt*, rather than *ſervice*, to the cauſe of *Religion*; as 'tis raking into *old ſores*; giving new life to *old cavils*; ſolving objections which you call *ſtale and trivial*, by anſwers as *ſtale and as trivial* too; for had theſe ever been ſatisfactory, the others could hardly have ſubſiſted to this day. To confirm this, I ſhall not follow you thro' all the *texts you vindicate*, but content my ſelf with a *few remarks* on *two or three* of the greateſt importance; in the explication of which you ſeem to have taken the greateſt pains. To begin then with your vindication of the *ſcriptural hiſtory of man's fall.*

The *Author* you are confuting ſays, it ſeems, *that Chriſtians are now aſhamed of the literal interpretation of this ſtory* [a]: which tho' you ſeem diſpoſed to treat as a *Calumny*, yet 'tis certain and undeniable, that *all Commentators* whatſoever are forced in ſome meaſure *to deſert the letter*, in order to make the ſtory *rational and credible.* You tell us, with many of them, that the *Deceiver was a real Serpent, actuated by the Devil* [b]; this you declare ſufficient to *obviate all difficulties*, to ſolve *all objections:* yet *Moſes*, you own, ſays not *one word of the Devil*; nor *had occaſion to ſay any thing of him*; nay, *that it was better he ſhou'd ſay nothing of him, becauſe he had ſaid nothing of him* [c]: but whether it were better or worſe, it is certain however, that the *introducing a Devil is contrary to the letter*; which ſpeaks onely of a *proper and meer Serpent*, as the author of this deception; and ſuggeſts the reaſon both of the attempt and the ſucceſs of it, in the *natural cunning* of that beaſt. *For the Serpent was more ſubtil than any beaſt of the field*; and by *his ſubtilty*, ſays St. *Paul* [a], *he deceived Eve*; who in making her defence to God, does not plead that the *Devil*, which had been a much better excuſe, but that the *Serpent deceived her.* You tell us, on another occaſion, that *God accommodates his Phraſes to the language of men, in order to be better underſtood by men* [b]*:* Pray tell us then, Good Sir, how he has *accommodated his Phraſes* here; whether that he may be *better underſtood of the Serpent, or of the Devil?*

---

[a] P. 14. [b] P. 15. [c] P. 13.

Now *becauſe the Serpent was more remarkably ſubtil, he was, you ſay* [c], *the propereſt inſtrument of the Tempter to deceive by; the beſt cover to conceal his fraud.* But here again moſt people will be of a different mind: for 'tis natural to be jealous and on our guard againſt the counſels, to diſtruſt all offers of kindneſs of the *ſubtle and malicious:* ſo that an *Aſs* or a *Dove* muſt needs have been a fitter engine for *Satan*, under the diſguiſe of folly or innocence, to have inſinuated his poiſon by. And tho' you tell us here, that *the apprehenſion Eve had of his ſubtilty might make her leſs ſurpriſed to hear him reaſon and diſcourſe*; yet in the very next page you declare it *natural to ſuppoſe, that for want of longer experience ſhe might not know whether any brute creatures were capable either of reaſon or ſpeech.* Can ſuch ſhuffling and inconſiſtency, think you, have any good effect towards *reſcuing the word of God from reproach and cenſure?*

'Tis the opinion, you ſay [d], *of ſome very worthy and learned perſons, that the Serpent was ſo like a Seraph, that Eve miſtook it for a good Angel.* The opinion indeed is very extravagant, that *Serpents* were originally in ſhape and beauty ſo like to *bleſſed Angels*, that it was eaſy to miſtake the one for the other. But

---

[a] 2 Cor. xi. 3. [b] P. 30. [c] P. 15. [d] P. 16.

as extravagant as it is, 'twas embraced by Biſhop *Patrick*, *Teniſon*, and many other learned men, to avoid what they thought the more extravagant of the two, the very opinion you maintain; which tho' you declare to have no kind of *difficulty or improbability* in it, yet Biſhop *Patrick* treats as ridiculous and *incredible* [a]: and what reaſonable hopes can you have of *converting Infidels and ſilencing Scepticks*, by the force of a ſolution which our *beſt Commentators* and *orthodox Biſhops* reject as *ſimple* and *fooliſh*?

But 'tis not *the extravagance* of this notion, but the *eaſineſs* of it, that offends you: it ſpoils the whole ſtory, by making it, as you ſay, *too eaſy*: this indeed is the true ſpirit of a *right orthodox Divine*; nothing *eaſy* will go down with him; nothing but the *marvellous* and the *improbable* will pleaſe him; and the good old principle *credo quia impoſſibile*, is with him the onely touchſtone of a true *ſaving Faith*.

But is the *Devil* then ſuch a *Hero*, that he ſcorns an *eaſy* conqueſt; nor cares to engage but where there's difficulty in the conflict? or is it inconſiſtent with the *goodneſs of God* to allow him a triumph *ſo eaſy*? 'Tis certain, that on ſome occaſions he *transforms himſelf into an angel of light* [b]: and where could he ever have more occaſion to do it than in the caſe we are conſidering? For if under that ſhape his victory was *too eaſy* before the *fall*, how much *eaſier* muſt it needs be now, in this *degenerate ſtate* of man? If the *eaſineſs* of it ſeemed then to reflect on the *goodneſs of God* for permitting it, how much more muſt it do ſo now, in ſuffering him with all that advantage to attack man when he *is down*, to trample on him when he is *fallen*?

But to proceed; tho' the *introduction of a Devil* may ſerve to clear up the difficulty of the *Serpent's ſpeaking and reaſoning*, yet it raiſes up a new one of a higher nature, which *your Author* charges upon it, againſt the *juſtice of God himſelf*, *in not interpo-*

---

[a] She was not ſo ſimple as to think that Beaſts could ſpeak——nor doth it ſeem at all credible to me, that ſhe could have been otherwiſe deceived, but by ſome creature which appeared ſo glorioufly, that ſhe took it for an heavenly Miniſter. *Comment on Gen.* iii. 1.

[b] 1 Cor. xi. 14.

ſing in ſo unequal a conflict. This objection, how merry ſoever you may make with it, by laughing at *your Author's want of Spectacles* [*a*], is certainly of weight enough to puzzle and ſtagger our reaſon: and every man has a right to require from thoſe, who pretend to be *guides and teachers of Religion,* how ſuch paſſages delivered and inculcated by them, as the *undoubted word of God,* can be reconciled to the known *attributes and perfections of the Deity.*

Should a *Father* diſcard and diſinherit *a Child,* for having deſerted ſome poſt aſſigned him; ſeduced either by the craft of ſome *old Sophiſter,* or driven off by the ſuperior ſtrength of ſome able bodied man, the Father all the while looking on, nor interpoſing at all in a trial ſo unreaſonable; wou'd not the fact be thought *barbarous* and *unnatural?* Now the conflict in ſuch caſe could not be more unequal than between our firſt *Parents and Satan*; and the love of *God to his Creatures* muſt neceſſarily be allowed ſuperior to that of *natural Fathers* to their *Children.* Yet you, Sir, ſee no *kind of difficulty,* and treat *the demand of a reaſon* on the occaſion as a *vain curioſity,* and *impertinent cavilling* [*b*]: ſince every body, you ſay, muſt needs ſee *how kind and indulgent God was in this whole proceeding* [*c*]: whereas, to ſpeak for my ſelf, I cannot from the *literal acceptation* of the ſtory, with all your *comment* upon it, ſee the leaſt ſymptom of *any kindneſs* or *indulgence* at all; but on the contrary, a neceſſity of flying to *allegory,* to account for the ſeeming injuſtice and unreaſonable ſeverity of the *Divine conduct.*

But ſince in a queſtion of this nature, both *your reaſon* and *mine* may poſſibly be ſuſpected, as if *prejudiced by education, influenced by cuſtom,* or *biaſſed* perhaps by *ſome intereſt* in favour of *eſtabliſhed opinions*; I ſhall appeal to an authority, which cannot be charged either with prejudice or partiality, with favouring or detracting from the credit of *Moſes*; one of the *greateſt Maſters of Reaſon* that *Antiquity* every produced, I mean *Cicero*;

[*a*] P. 18. [*b*] P. 20. [*c*] P. 19.

whoſe ſentiments declared in ſome caſes, nearly allied to the preſent, may ſerve to inform us what *unprejudiced Reaſon* would determine upon the *literal hiſtory of man's fall.*

Cicero tells us [*a*], *that the very Gods of the Poets, had they known how pernicious their gifts would prove to their Children, muſt be thought to have been wanting in point of kindneſs towards them.* What then wou'd he have thought of *God's foreſeeing the immediate fall of man*, yet *creating him to a ſtate of ſin and miſery?*

He ſays in another place, *that 'tis unworthy of God to do any thing in vain, for that wou'd be a reflection even upon man's conſtancy* [*b*]. What then cou'd he have judged of the *formation of a Paradiſe*, and all that *apparatus and proviſion for the bliſs and immortality of the firſt Pair*; which was no ſooner made than forfeited, and like a *Theatrical Scence* changed in an inſtant, to a proſpect of miſery and barrenneſs?

Again, it is, ſays he [*c*], *the common opinion of all Philoſophers, of what ſect ſoever, that the Deity can neither be angry, nor hurt any body.* How would he have been ſurprized then, to find *God* repreſented here as *fierce* and *enraged*, driving out his own creatures *in anger*, from the bliſs he had provided for them, and in a *kind of fury curſing the very earth* for their ſakes?

He exclaims on another occaſion, *Oh the wonderful equity of the Gods! wou'd any people endure the maker of ſuch a law, that the Son or Grandſon ſhould be puniſhed, becauſe the Father or Grandfather had offended* [*d*]?

How wou'd he have exclaimed then at *God*'s puniſhing ſo ſeverely not onely the *firſt Pair*, but *their whole poſterity*, the *whole*

[*a*] Atque is tamen ipſi Dii Poetici, ſi ſciſſent pernicioſa fore illa filiis, peccaſſe in beneficio putarentur. Nat. Deor. l. 3. 31. Edit. Davis.

[*b*] Nec enim ignorare Deus poteſt qua mente quiſque ſit: nec fruſtrà ac ſine cauſa quid facere dignum Deo eſt, quod abhorret etiam ab hominis conſtantia. De Divin. l. 2. 60.

[*c*] At hoc commune eſt omnium Philoſophorum—nunquam nec iraſci Deum nec nocere. De off. 3. 27.

[*d*] O miram æquitatem Deorum! ferret ne ulla Civitas latorem iſtiuſmodi legis, ut condemnaretur filius, aut nepos, ſi pater aut avus deliquiſſet? De Nat. Deor. 3. 38.

race of mankind for their ſin; and even the *Serpent* too, for the fraud of the *Devil?*

Laſtly, upon mention of a *dream of Alexander the Great, that a Serpent appeared to him, and told him where he might find a certain root to cure his friend Ptolemy of a wound which was judged mortal:* laughing at the ſtory, *the Serpent,* ſays he, *ſeemed to talk to Alexander: this, whether true or falſe, has nothing in it; ſince he did not really hear him ſpeak, but ſeemed onely to do ſo* [*a*]. But how wou'd he have laugh'd at *your literal ſtory,* of a *Serpent actually ſpeaking and reaſoning,* without moving the leaſt wonder and ſurprize in the hearer? Theſe paſſages may ſerve, I ſay, to ſhew what unprejudiced reaſon wou'd have thought of the *vulgar hiſtory of man's fall:* and tho' you, Sir, can ſwallow and digeſt the whole, without the leaſt difficulty or reluctance; yet what *offence,* what *contradiction to reaſon,* is to be found in every *ſingle article* of the account?

'Tis neceſſary then, for the *ſatisfaction of our reaſon,* and the *quieting our ſcruples,* to deſert the *outward letter,* and ſearch for the *hidden, allegorical* ſenſe of the ſtory: where I ſhall not take the trouble of collecting all the fancies and whimſical ſolutions of the *Rabbins and the Fathers*; but content myſelf with propoſing one, which appears to me the moſt probable and rational of them all; *viz.* that by *Adam* we are to underſtand *reaſon* or *the mind of man*; by *Eve,* the *fleſh* or *outward ſenſes*; by the *Serpent, luſt* or *pleaſure:* In which *Allegory* we ſee clearly explained the true cauſes of *man's fall* and *degeneracy:* that as ſoon as *his mind,* through the weakneſs and treachery of *his ſenſes,* became captivated and ſeduced by the allurements of *luſt and pleaſure,* he was driven *by God out of Paradiſe*; that is, loſt and forfeited the happineſs and proſperity which he had enjoyed in his innocence. All this is intelligible and rational; agreeable not only to the common notions and tradition of hiſtory, but to the conſtant and eſtabliſhed method of *God's Providence*, who has wiſely conſtituted *miſery*, *ſorrow*, *and the debaſement of our nature*, to be the *natural and neceſſary effect* of *vice* and *ſin*.

[*a*] Alexandro loqui draco viſus eſt. Poteſt hoc eſſe falſum, poteſt verum: ſed utrum ſit, non eſt mirabile; non enim audivit ille draconem loquentem, ſed viſus eſt audire. De Divin. l. 2. 68.

This interpretation is embraced by ſeveral of the *Antients*; particularly St. *Auſtin*; who tells us, *that the ſame thing is acted over again in every one of us, as oft as we fall into ſin, that was repreſented by the Serpent, the Woman and the Man: for there's firſt*, ſays he, *a ſuggeſtion or inſinuation; either by a thought or the ſenſes of the body; by which if our inclination is not prevailed with to ſin, then is the ſubtilty of the Serpent baffled and vaniſhed; but if 'tis prevailed with, then we yield, as it were, to the perſuaſions of the Woman: and when our reaſon has thus conſented to execute what our luſt had moved, then is Man effectually driven out and expelled from all poſſeſſion of happineſs, as from a Paradiſe* [a]. Now whatever opinion *this Father* might on other occaſions declare, (as he was not always very conſiſtent with himſelf) yet at the time of writing the book, whence this paſſage is taken, he was perſuaded, that in the *hiſtory of the creation and fall of man*, we could not avoid *abſurdities and blaſphemy towards God*, without giving up the *literal meaning*, and truſting wholly to *an allegorical* expoſition of it [b].

I have met with a *myſtical Fable* among the Antients, not very unlike the caſe before us: *that Man having obtained of Jove a remedy, to preſerve him in perpetual health and vigour, and prevent all the evils and infirmities of age, laid it on an Aſs to carry for him; but the Aſs being very dry and wanting to drink, was cheated of it by a Serpent, guardian of the ſpring; who perſuaded him to exchange his load for a draught of water: and ſo the Serpent has ever ſince enjoyed the benefit of it, renewing its youth and*

---

[a] De Geneſ. contra Manich. l. 2. c. 12.

[b] Si autem nullus exitus datur, ut piè & dignè Deo quæ ſcripta ſunt intelligantur, niſi figuratè atque in ænigmatis propoſita iſta credamus, habentes Auctoritatem Apoſtolicam, modum quem intendimus teneamus—ut omnes iſtas figuras rerum ſecundum Catholicam Fidem——explicemus, &c. Ibid. c. 3.

vigour every year, whilſt man is left to languiſh by diſeaſes and decay [*a*].

Moſes, we read, *was learned in all the wiſdom of the Ægyptians* [*b*]; and their learning, eſpecially in things *ſacred and divine*, was wholly *myſtical and ſymbolical*; propoſed always under the figures of *men, beaſts and birds*, which were called *Hieroglyphicks*, or ſacred characters; invented and uſed by them, as *Kircher* [*c*] has ſhewn, before *Moſes*'s time: amongſt theſe, the *Serpent*, as all Authors inform us, was of more common uſe with them, than any other animal; whoſe nature they imagined to have ſomething *very excellent and divine* in it [*d*]. So that it ſupplied the place of *two letters of their ſymbolical Alphabet*; and ſerved them as an *Hieroglyphick* of various ſignification; more particularly as an *emblem of ſubtlety and cunning*, as well as of *luſt* and *ſenſual pleaſure* [*e*]. Whence it cannot ſeem improbable, that *Moſes*'s *account of the fall* might be drawn from principles and notions imbibed in his youth in the *Schools of the Ægyptians*.

Moses was learned in all the Wisdom of the Egyptians, mystical Symbolical Hieroglyphical.

Kircher

The Serpent

Emblem of Cunning, and Pleasure.

The Fall drawn from Egyptian Hieroglyphics.

Dr. *Spencer*, explaining this cuſtom of the *Ægyptians*, of delivering all *the ſublimer parts* of knowledge under the cover of *Symbols, Types and Emblems*, obſerves, that *when God called out* Moſes *to his Prophetick Office, he conſidered him as one who had been trained up in that kind of learning; and that 'tis conſonant therefore to the character and hiſtory of* Moſes, *to imagine that God deſigned, that he ſhould write and treat of all the ſublime things committed to him, in that myſtical and hieroglyphical way of literature in which he had been educated* [*f*].

Spencer.

The

[*a*] Nicandri Theriac. Edit. Ald. p. 7. §. 17. & Scholia ib.

[*b*] Acts vii. 22.

[*c*] Vid. Kircher. Obeliſc. Pamphil. l. 2. de inſtitutione & fabrica Hieroglyphicor. c 2. p. 102, &c.

Primi per figuras animalium Ægyptii ſenſus mentis effingebant. Tacit. Annal. l. 11. c. 14.

[*d*] Nihil inter Hieroglyphica Symbola Serpente frequentius—cum enim viderent Serpentem animal igneo Spiritu plenum, vivax, &c. fieri non poſſe crediderunt, quin aliquid magnum, excellens & prorſus divinum ſub iis lateret. Ibid. l. 4. Ideæ Hieroglyph. p. 347.

[*e*] Ib. l. 2. c. 6. p. 131. It. Pierii Valerian. Hieroglyph. l. 14.

[*f*] Cum Deus ad Munus propheticum Moſem evocavit, eum tanquam virum Hiero-

Spencer

The mention of *Ægyptian learning* leads me naturally to conſider, in the next place, your anſwer to this *Author*'s cavil againſt the *divine inſtitution of Circumciſion*; which he would inſinuate to have been borrowed onely from *Ægypt*. This objection you make *ſlight of*, and tell us, that there is *no ground for it* [*a*]; and tho' *your Adverſary*, from the nature of his objection, muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe the *ſcriptural account of Circumciſion to be a fiction*; yet you very gravely ſpend two or three pages to prove that his notion cannot be true, becauſe 'tis inconſiſtent with that *ſame Scripture:* from which you conclude at laſt, that the *Ægyptians had not any circumciſion at all.* A likely method indeed to confute him, by excluding all teſtimony in the caſe, but what he excepts to, as *forged* for the very purpoſe. For you tell him [*b*], that *neither* Diodorus Siculus, *nor* Herodotus, *nor even* Sanchoniatho, *can be of weight ſufficient to determine this queſtion*; *tho' ſome conjectures may be raiſed from the laſt of the three*——Which way the conjectures you hint at would lead us, I ſhall not at preſent examine; but am ſure, that of *the three* you name, *Sanchoniatho*, on whom you lay the greateſt ſtreſs, is on all accounts the *leaſt qualified* or *worthy* to ſuggeſt *any opinion*, or ground *any conjecture* at all upon: and as I have a reſpect for the *other two*, whom I have read with ſome diligence, I cannot ſuffer *their Authority* to be thrown off *ſo ſlightly*, without ſpending a word or two upon it.

Herodotus

Herodotus tells us then, that *all other mortals*, *except ſuch as had learnt the thing from* Ægypt, *preſerved their members as nature had formed them*; *but that the* Ægyptians *circumciſed themſelves for the ſake of cleanlineſs* [*c*]. And in another place, that *the* Phœnicians *and* Syrians *who inhabited* Paleſtine, (that is, the *Jews*) *confeſſed*, *that they had received the cuſtom of Circumciſion from the* Ægyptians [*d*].

Hieroglyphicis Ægpti literis enutritum tractavit, &c. *De Legib. Hebræor. T.* 1. *l.* 1. *c.* 15. *p.* 211.

[*a*] P. 60.

[*b*] P. 56.

[*c*] Vid. Herod. l. 2. xxxvi, xxxvii. Edit. Lond.

[*d*] Ibid. civ.

Diodorus Siculus.

Diodorus Siculus confirms the ſame thing; that this practice was *originally Ægyptian*, and that both the *Jews and People of* Colchus derived it anciently from them [a].

Strabo

Strabo too declares, that *Circumciſion* was one of the moſt *famed and remarkable cuſtoms of* Ægypt; *but in uſe alſo with the Jews, who were originally* Ægyptians [b].

Now of all the Writers, who at all touch this queſtion, theſe are the onely ones I know of in Antiquity, that can be called unprejudiced, and whoſe credibility cannot be liable to ſuſpicion either of malice or partiality in the caſe: and 'twas the authority of theſe that induced the *learned Marſham*, and the *no leſs learned Spencer* too, to favour the opinion of your adverſary; all which you ſtill contemn as inſufficient to ground even a *ſupicion*, or raiſe a *conjecture* upon.

Joſephus.

Joſephus, who in his defence of *the Jews againſt* Apion, takes occaſion more than once to mention this *teſtimony of Herodotus*, inſtead of cenſuring or attempting to confute it, argues from it as from a thing granted: *The* Ægyptians, ſays he [c], *are all circumciſed, and abſtain from ſwine's fleſh—wherefore* Apion *is a fool to abuſe the* Jews, *for the ſake of thoſe, who not onely uſe the very cuſtoms he finds fault with, but who taught other people alſo the uſe of Circumciſion, as* Herodotus *has informed us.* And in giving the character of *Moſes*, as of an *excellent Governour*, and *wiſe Legiſlator*; *never uſing the great power he was poſſeſſed of to any advantage of his own, but the ſole benefit of thoſe who had entruſted him with it*, &c. *Such an one*, ſays he [d], *whoſe intentions were ſo juſt and noble, might reaſonably preſume, that he had God for his Guide and Counſellor, and having once perſuaded himſelf of this, he judged it neceſſary above all things to inſtil the ſame notion into the people; that every thing he did was directed by the will of Heaven; not acting herein*

---

[a] L. 1. p. 24. Edit. Rhodomanni.

[b] L. 17. p. 824. Edit. Iſ. Caſaub.

[c] Εκεῖνοι τοίνυν ἅπαντες καὶ περιτέμνονται καὶ χοιρείων ἀπέχονται βρωμάτων, &c. Contr. Ap. l. 2. c. 13. Edit. Hudſ.

[d] Ἀλλ' οἷον παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν αὐχοῦσιν τὸν Μίνω γεγονέναι καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους νομοθέτας, &c. Ibid. c. 16.

This is very curious!
Was Josephus a Philoso
phical Unbeliever!

the part of a Magician or Impoſtor, as ſome have unjuſtly aſperſed him, but like the famed Lawgivers of Greece; *who, to make their good deſigns the more effectual, uſed to aſcribe the invention of their own Laws to the Gods; and more eſpecially like* Minos, *who imputed all his Inſtitutions to* Apollo *and the* Delphic *Oracle.*

Such a declaration as this from *ſo learned a Jew,* in defending the excellency and pre-eminence of *his own Religion,* might teach us to entertain more moderate and qualified ſentiments concerning its *divine origin,* as well as the *divine inſpiration* of its *Founder, Moſes*; which whilſt aſſerted in that *abſolute and unlimited* ſenſe, that Divines of your zeal and principles contend for, will ever prove a ſtumbling block to men of underſtanding, and obſtruct the advancement of Religion, by making its Authority queſtionable and ſuſpected.

But laying aſide Authorities, let's conſider a little on which ſide the probability lies: *Ægypt* was a great and powerful nation, famed every where abroad, and valuing themſelves highly at home for their *wiſdom* and *learning*; ſo that the *Philoſophers* and Learned of all countries uſed to travel thither, as to the *beſt School of Arts and Sciences: Pythagoras,* we read, brought all his knowledge from thence, and complied ſo far, as to be *circumciſed* amongſt them, on purpoſe to procure a more *intimate admiſſion into their myſteries* [a].

Pythagoras circumcised in Egypt.

The *Jews,* on the other hand, were an obſcure contemptible people, famed for no kind of literature; ſcarce known to the polite world, till the *Roman* Empire diſperſed them; and then the more deſpiſed onely for being known: they had been brought out of *Ægypt,* according to the *Scripture account,* in ſuch a manner, as could leave no impreſſion in their favor in the memory of the *Ægyptians*; or, as *profane Authors* ſay, had been *expelled* by them on account of ſome *filthy diſeaſe* [b]: Which then is the more probable; that a people valuing themſelves ſo much on their wiſdom, ſhould borrow ſo remarkable a cuſtom from a Nation they always hated and deſpiſed [a]; or that the *Lawgiver* of a *petty infant State* ſhould copy that, as well as many other of his conſtitutions, from the practice of *a great and floriſhing Kingdom?*

---

[a] Ἀπὸ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἐξήνεγκε τὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ δόξης. Suidas. δι' οὓς καὶ περιετέμετο, &c. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 1. p. 354. Edit. Potter.

[b] Plurimi auctores conſentiunt, orta per Ægyptum tabe, quæ corpora fœdaret, Regem

Tacitus.

Beſides, thoſe who affirm *Circumciſion* to be of *Hebrew original*, and thence propagated to other Nations, have no one Author of Antiquity to ſupport their opinion, but ſuch as take up with it on the credit of a tradition derived from the *ſcriptural account* of its inſtitution: and as they are deſtitute of all Authority, ſo they cannot agree either on *the perſon* who firſt introduced it, or the *period of time* when it was ſo introduced into *Ægypt*. Some aſcribe it to *Abraham*; ſome to the credit and example of *Joſeph*; others to *Jacob* and *his Sons*, upon their ſettlement in *Ægypt*; others to the traffick and intercourſe between the *Jews* and *Ægyptians*, eſpecially in *Solomon*'s time, who had both a *ſtrict alliance* and *commerce* with them. Now tho' all theſe opinions are wholly groundleſs and irrational, yet none of them ſeems ſo improbable, as that which you embrace; that this cuſtom was carried into *Ægypt* by *Abraham's poſterity the Arabian Iſhmaelites* [b]: for how can it be imagined, that a ſet of *wild Arabs* or *wandring Shepherds*, an *occupation abominable to the Ægyptians* [c], of all men the moſt barbarous and illiterate, could have authority enough with a *polite and learned Nation* to eſtabliſh ſo *odious* and *painful a cuſtom* amongſt them?

Moſes, as is ſaid above, was trained in all the *learning of the Ægyptians*; which learning was employed more eſpecially in the *ſtudy of Theology*: they were held the *firſt inventers of religious Rites and*

Regem Bocchorim, adito Hammonis Oraculo, remedium petentem, purgare regnum & id genus hominum ut inviſum Deis alias in terras avehere juſſum. Tacit. Hiſt. 5. 3.

Joſephus Dicunt Ægyptii Moſem patriâ Heliopolitem eſſe, unum e Sacerdotibus, ob lepram cum aliis pulſum. Joſ. con. Apion, l. 1. 31: 26. Vid. it. Juſtin. l. 36. c. 2.

[a] Μάλιστα πρὸς ἡμᾶς δυσμενῶς διατεθέντες, κοινῇ μὲν ἅπαντες Αἰγύπτιοι. Joſeph. con. Ap. l. 1. 13.

[b] P. 60.

[c] Gen. xlvi. 34.

Ægyptians the first Inventors of Pomps,

Golden Calf. Apis

Brazen Serpent

Isiac table of Bembo obelisks.

Addicted to Miracles

One High Priest

No blemish

Washing

Ceremonies, of Pomps and Proceſſions [a]. And where was *this learning* of his more likely to exert itſelf; where could we ſo naturally expect to ſee its influence, as in forming the *civil and eccleſiaſtical polity* of his *new commonwealth?* But whatever effect it would naturally have, 'tis certain, that the ſtrong inclination of the people for all *Ægyptian cuſtoms*, their eagerneſs to relapſe on all occaſions into *Ægyptian Idolatry*, of which we have ſo many inſtances in their hiſtory, would neceſſarily oblige him to indulge them, even againſt his will, in the uſe of many rites they were ſo fond of: his back was no ſooner turned, than they prevailed with *Aaron* to make them a *Golden Calf*; which was nothing elſe but recalling the worſhip of the *Ægyptian God Apis*, repreſented always under that form [b]: and the ſetting up the *brazen Serpent* ſeems to have been done in condeſcenſion to the ſame humour; being an object they had been uſed to *reverence* in *Ægypt*; where, from the *Iſiac Table of Bembo*, the *Obeliſks*, and other *Ægyptian* monuments, it appears, that the *Image of a Serpent erected in that manner on a pillar*, had extraordinary honors and a ſuperſtitious veneration paid to it [c]. And in fact, we ſee many cuſtoms and conſtitutions in the *Jewiſh laws*, which are evidently derived from this ſource. The *Ægyptians* were governed *by laws and cuſtoms peculiar* to themſelves, and different from thoſe of other nations [d]; were more addicted to *prodigies and miracles*, than any other people [e]; had *one High Prieſt*; as well as an hereditary Prieſthood, deſcending from Father to Son [f]; ſuffered no *blemiſh or imperfection* in the beaſt they ſacrificed [g]; were ſuperſtitiouſly nice and ſcrupulous about *waſhing and cleanſing* themſelves; nor durſt appear at divine worſhip when defiled by the *touch of any thing unclean* [a]; would not ſuffer any *leprous perſon* to come *within the City* [b]; abhorred *ſwine's fleſh as impure and abominable* [c]. All which cuſtoms of theirs and many more, that we meet with in the *Jewiſh Law*, as they ſeem the plain effects of *Moſes's Ægyptian learning*, ſo they furniſh ſtill the more ground to ſuſpect that *Circumciſion* too might poſſibly have the *ſame origin*. *Spencer* on this very argument, declares, that *God, when he gave his Law, thought fit to tolerate and transfer into his own worſhip many cuſtoms and inſtitutions which the people had been trained up to in* Ægypt, *the better to accommodate himſelf to their humours and affections* [d].

---

[a] Herodot. l. 2. lviii.

[b] Videtur mihi idcirco Populus Iſrael in ſolitudine feciſſe ſibi caput vituli quod coleret; ut quod in Ægypto didicerant Ἄπιν & Μνεῦιν, qui ſub figura boum coluntur, eſſe Deos, hoc in ſua ſuperſtitione ſervarent. Hieron. Comment. in Oſee Proph. c. 4.

[c] Pier. Valerian. Hieroglyph. l. 14. it. Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l. 1. c. 10.

[d] Herod. l. 2. xci.

[e] Ib. lxxxii.

[f] Herod. l. 2. xxxvii.

[g] Ib. xxxviii.

Leprous Person

Swines Flesh

From conſidering the *origin of Circumciſion*, you examine the *Author's cavils* to the thing itſelf: who thinks it ſtrange, *that cutting off the Foreſkin (not to be performed without great pain and hazard) could have been eſteemed a religious duty acceptable to a good and gracious God, who makes nothing in vain, much leſs what requires cutting off, even with extreme danger and anguiſh* [e]

In anſwer to this; as to the *pain* of the operation, you repreſent it as *ſlight and inconſiderable*, and make no more of *cutting off the Foreſkin*, than the *Navelſtring* in Infants ſo young [f]. And as to the *Hazard* of it, you contemn the very thought, and jeeringly call upon him for *a liſt of ſuch, as had ever died of it*. And here I cannot but expect, that he will return your own compliment upon you: what; *no genius for Literature! no acquaintance with common Criticks and Commentators!* for the commoneſt of them all would have informed you, that the *pain of Circumciſion* was not onely very *acute and grievous*, but the *Hazard* of it too ſo great, that it often proved *mortal*. *Spencer*, in the words of *Maimonides*, tells us, That *it was not like a ſlight hurt of the leg, or burning of the arm, but a moſt harſh and dangerous thing, not to*

---

[a] Ib. xxxvii. xlvii, lxiv.

[b] Ib. cxxxviii.

[c] Ib. xlvii.

[d] Deum, cum legem daret, ritus & inſtituta non pauca toleraſſe & in cultum ſuum tranſtuliſſe, &c. de Legib. Heb. T. 1. l. 1. c. 13.

[e] P. 63.

[f] P. 64.

be undergone without ſome hazard of life [a]. And *Lightfoot* informs us, that the *frequent mortality* it occaſioned, produced a *ſtanding law*; that when any perſon had *loſt three Children ſucceſſively by the operation, he was to be excuſed from circumciſing the reſt; in conſequence of which there were actually many uncircumciſed among them, who, in thoſe circumſtances, were eſteemed ſtill to be in all points as good Iſraelites, and even as perfect Prieſts as any of the reſt.* This perhaps will ſtartle you, who have talked ſo raſhly on a ſubject you were not acquainted with; and you'll be the more ſurprized to find a *Poſitive Precept* ſuſpended by human Authority for civil and temporal ends; yet you will ſcarce except to my Author, who was both learned and orthodox, and to him I ſhall refer you for the *liſt* you *inſultingly* call for of thoſe who had *died by the operation* [b].

As to the other part of the *Cavil*, that *God does nothing in vain*; you anſwer; that the *Foreſkin was not made in vain*; that in *ordinary caſes it was better to have it on, than off*; *but for extraordinary*, it was wiſely contrived, that there might be *ſomething to ſpare, ſomething to cut off as occaſion ſhould require* [c]: A moſt *admirable Solution*; which amounts juſt to this; that had not *God wiſely provided it*, he could never have ordered it to be *cut off*.

But ſince *your Author* is ſo impertinent in demanding reaſons for every thing, I wonder you would not oblige him with ſome of thoſe, which your *favourites the Criticks* have collected on this very occaſion; which ſince you have omitted, I ſhall take the liberty to ſupply, by preſenting him with one or two furniſhed by the *ſame Lightfoot. The land of Canaan*, ſays he, *was bequeathed to Sem by his Father Noah; becauſe Cham and his Son Canaan had derided Noah's nakedneſs: when therefore the land was to be ſettled on the right heirs of Sem; a Seal and an Aſſurance thereof is given in that member, which had been derided by Canaan to the loſs of that land. This was a main reaſon why males alone were circumciſed, and why in that member* [a].

---

[a] Nam non eſt levis aliqua cruris læſio vel brachii aduſtio, ſed res duriſſima & difficillima, nec ſine vitæ diſcrimine quandoque ſubeunda. De Leg. Heb. l. 1. c. 14.

[b] You will wonder, Reader, to hear that ſome Jews were always uncircumciſed; yea, that ſome Prieſts not circumciſed miniſtred at the Altar; and that without the complaint of any, and indeed without any fault—Very frequent mention is made in the Talmudiſts of an uncircumciſed Iſraelite, and an uncircumciſed Prieſt—If the firſt, ſecond, third ſon ſhould die by Circumciſion, thoſe that were born after were not circumciſed; and yet Iſraelites in all reſpects; Prieſts in all reſpects. Lightf. Vol. II. p. 760.

[c] P. 65.

He gives the reaſon alſo why it was to be performed always on the eighth day. That *as there were ſeven Nations in the land, which the Iſraelites were to ſubdue, ſo every child of Abraham for ſeven days was like the children of thoſe ſeven Nations; but on the eighth was to receive Circumciſion, the pledge of his claim to that land* [b].

'Tis a thouſand pities that this *Adverſary of yours* has *no reliſh*, as you ſay, *for this kind of Literature*; no reverence for *Criticks or Commentators*; for could he be brought once to *this taſte*, we ſhould ſoon ſee an end of all his *Scruples*, nor be teized any longer with the *impertinence of Cavils*. Thus where the *over-nice Gentleman*, as you call him, is pleaſed to cavil at *God's being ſaid in Scripture ſo often to repent*; you tell him, that *there's not one Commentator of note, but would have ſet him right, had he been diſpoſed to learn, before he ſet up to teach* [c]. For theſe *Commentators* would have told him, I preſume, the very ſame thing that you do in the words immediately following, *viz.* that *God is unchangeable and repenteth not in a proper ſenſe; but when he undoes what he had before done; or changes his firſt meaſures, as circumſtances require, he is ſaid to repent:* that is as much as to ſay; *God is really and in his own nature unchangeable*, unleſs when occaſion requires him to be *changeable*; nor ever *changes his mind*, but as oft as he *changes his meaſures.*

Strange force of *Prejudice!* that ſuch *a jingle of words* without the *leaſt mixture of ſenſe* can paſs with a man of learning, for a grave anſwer to an Objection ſo important.

---

[a] Lightfoot, Vol. I. p. 464.

[b] Ib. 465.

[c] P. 29.

Babel.

I ſhall next conſider briefly your account of the *Confuſion at Babel: a ſtory invented,* as your Adverſary would inſinuate, *by the Author of the Pentateuch* [a], *to account for the variety of languages obſervable in the world* which he knew not how to ſolve by *natural cauſes.* But here again you tell him in your *uſual ſtile,* that he has not *any reaſon or colour of reaſon.* As to the ſtory itſelf, every one muſt needs own it to be a *ſtrange one:* Some writers *allegorize* it, to a meaning quite different from the *letter*; others interpret it ſo as to exclude *all miracle* [b]: but whatever we are to collect from it, 'tis certain, that it has never made any great impreſſion on men of letters, however pious otherwiſe and religious; who in tracing the *origin and antiquity* of the ſeveral *languages,* ſeldom think it neceſſary to run back to *Babel*; but find the cauſe to be grounded in *reaſon and nature*; in the *neceſſary mutability of human things*; the *riſe and fall of States* and *Empires*; *change of modes and cuſtoms,* which neceſſarily introduce a *proportionable change in language.*

'Tis from theſe principles, that men of learning have in fact demonſtrated the cauſes, and deduced the hiſtory of *moſt particular languages* from their ſource and origin; not onely of thoſe, which now obtain, but of ſuch alſo, as tho' once flouriſhing, are now no longer in common uſe and practice; as the *Greek, Latin, Italian, French,* &c.

Many both of the Antients and Moderns, have endeavoured to prove; that the *Hebrew* was the *firſt and common language* of all, till in proceſs of time, thro' the influence of the cauſes above hinted at, all other languages ſprang out of it, as naturally, as *many ſhoots* from the *ſame root, many branches* from the *ſame ſtock* [c].

As theſe obſervations are grounded on fact, and the teſtimony of hiſtory; and *all the variety of languages,* that have ever obtained in the world, may be accounted for by ordinary and natural cauſes, which operate in the ſame manner at this day, and will always continue to do ſo as long as the world laſts; as this, I ſay, is certain, we cannot but allow that there's ſome *colour of reaſon* in your *Adverſary*'s ſuſpicion, that the *Author of the Pentateuch*, for want of reflecting on the natural cauſes of this *variety*, thought proper to have recourſe to *miracle* and *the intermediate interpoſition of God* in order to procure the greater reverence and dignity to his hiſtory. Eſpecially, ſince without any *ſuch miracle*, as all men of ſenſe will allow, the ſame effect muſt neceſſarily have followed from the *very diſperſion* and *propagation of mankind*.

---

[a] P. 41.

[b] See Calmet Diſſert. ſur la premiere langue. p. 3, &c.

[c] Ut ſcire poſſimus linguam Hebraicam omnium linguarum eſſe matricem. Hieron. in Sophon. Proph. c. 3. v. 18.

Allegory

But to examine your anſwer to this *Cavil*. You ſay, that *Moſes in that place is not accounting ſo much for the variety of languages (which was a trifle in compariſon) as for the quick diſperſion of the Sons of Noah over the face of the earth—Thorns and Briars were ſpringing up every where, Woods and Thickets ſpreading themſelves around, wild Beaſts encreaſing; and all this while the Sons of Noah gathering together in a Cluſter and deſigning to continue ſo, inſtead of diſperſing to repleniſh and cultivate the earth. God would not bear their loitering, but interpoſed miraculouſly; and by confounding their language, confounded their ill-contrived project* [a]. What an abſurd and ridiculous account of things is this? The *Sons of Noah*, it ſeems, had formed a conſpiracy to fruſtrate the deſign of Providence in peopling the world; by *hanging together in cluſters*; reſolving neither to *diſperſe* nor *cultivate the ground*; and ſo muſt ſoon have been choaked up by *thorns and briars, woods and thickets*, or devoured by *wild beaſts*, which were multiplying apace upon them, had not God miraculouſly interpoſed to prevent it. 'Tis well however for the *Scripture you are vindicating*, that it furniſhes no ground for ſuch a *vindication*; but that all this nonſenſe is purely your own.

For from the Chapter you refer to [b], 'tis evident, that the *Sons of Noah* were ſo far from any ſuch reſolution of *not diſperſing themſelves*, that they had already begun to *diſperſe*; had actually

---

[a] P. 42.

[b] Geneſ. c. xi.

ſent off a Colony from the *Eaſt to the Plains of Shinar.* *About an hundred years after the flood,* ſays *Calmet*, *when mankind found themſelves too numerous, to be able to continue any longer together, they reſolved to diſperſe themſelves, and ſend out colonies into different countries* [*a*]. For this is not to be underſtood, ſays Biſhop *Patrick* [*b*], *of all the Poſterity of Noah; much leſs of Noah himſelf; but of a great colony of them; who when the Eaſt was much peopled, choſe to go Weſtward.* And again; *they continued,* ſays he, *in the mountainous Countries of the Eaſt, till they grew very numerous and wanted room; and then deſcended into the Plain, and ſome of them went weſtwardly.* And even thoſe, who had marched into this *Plain*, were ſo far ſtill from any thought of *hanging together in cluſters*, that they knew and clearly ſaw that it would ſoon be neceſſary for them to *diſperſe* ſtill further into other parts of the Earth, but had a mind, before *ſuch diſperſion*, to erect ſome *publick monument* of their common origin, by *building a City and a Tower that ſhould reach as high as Heaven*; and it was the preſumption and arrogance of this deſign, that induced *God* to baffle it by *confounding their language* [*c*]; and to *diſperſe them* from that place, without ſuffering them to finiſh what they had projected. This is all that can be collected from this ſtory, by any rational method of interpretation: and the ſtory itſelf ſeems introduced for no other purpoſe but to account for the *origin of the different languages* that obtain in the world: nor is there the leaſt ground for the notion of their *hanging together in cluſters*, and reſolving neither to *ſeparate themſelves*, nor *cultivate the ground*: a notion wholly extravagant and contradictory to ſenſe and reaſon: for were it poſſible for them to form ſuch a deſign, it could not be poſſible to execute it: a multitude daily growing cannot *hang together in cluſters*; muſt of neceſſity *diſperſe*, in proportion to the encreaſe of their numbers; *want of room* will force them to ſeek *new quarters*; *want of food* to *cultivate the earth*: and you may as well tell us of *waters gathering together on heaps*, as of *multitudes gathering in cluſters* to prevent their own diſperſion. I know no animals, that hang ſo much *in cluſters as Bees*, yet even theſe *diſperſe* themſelves every year, and ſend out *colonies*, as oft as the *old Hive* becomes too narrow for the entertainment of their *encreaſed family:* the ſame nature, that puſhes the infant forward from the *narrow womb* into the *wide world*, and from *childhood* ſtretches him out to *man*, will always oblige a growing people to ſpread and enlarge themſelves as ſoon as their *cluſtering together* becomes uneaſy and inconvenient.

[*a*] Calmet Diſſert. ſur la premiere langue, p. 3.

[*b*] Comm. on Gen. xi. 2.

[*c*] Quoniam de pœna venit multiplicatio, mutatione linguarum. Auguſt. de Civ. Dei, l. 16. c. 12.

I cannot imagine then whence you took this ſilly notion, unleſs from *the picture of Hobbes's Leviathan*; where we ſee juſt ſuch *a refractory multitude* as you deſcribe, all *cluſtered up together into one gigantick Figure*, as if reſolved and prepared in that collected form to combat heaven itſelf. Hobbs's Leviathan

After all; you conclude this article with great ſeeming complacency and ſatisfaction in the clearneſs of your ſolution; wondering what *poſſible Offence* your adverſary can take at it, and defying him to furniſh a *better rationale* of it than you have given. But, pray Sir, what has he to do to give *any rationale at all* of a ſtory, which he does not believe? Or ſhould he frankly confeſs that he cannot find a *better*, yet I would not adviſe you to triumph too ſoon, leſt he ſhould reply, that 'tis for that very reaſon he rejects the whole ſtory, becauſe there's no *better ſolution* of it than yours to be had; and he cannot take up with a *rationale*, that has not *a ſcrap of reaſon or ſenſe* in it.

I ſhall not trouble myſelf with following you any further through your Anſwers to the *Objections of this Author:* I have already ſaid enough to ſhew the Truth of what is above hinted, that the taſk you have undertaken of *vindicating the particular texts of Scripture* from *cavil and exception*; or *reſcuing*, as you ſay, *the Word of God from reproach and blaſphemy*, is much more likely to furniſh matter for *new Scandal*, than extinguiſh *the old:* for this, as far as my experience has reached, has always been, and will for ever be the conſequence of *this method of defending*

Reli-

Religion: ſince 'tis built upon a *wrong principle*, and proceeds upon a *ſyſtem*, that cannot be maintained, *viz.* that *every ſingle paſſage of the Scriptures, we call Canonical, muſt needs be received, as the very word and as the voice of God himſelf.* This notion, which you every where inculcate, as 'tis falſe in itſelf, ſo muſt neceſſarily lead you into error and abſurdity, and expoſe you to the contempt and ridicule of all rational men, who can never embrace an *Hypotheſis*, however confidently aſſerted, which they ſee contrary to *fact* and the *plain conviction of their ſenſes.*

False System

'Tis the Obſervation of a *late grave Author*, much verſed in reflections of this kind, that there's *no greater cauſe of modern infidelity, than that ſome opinions and rites are carried to ſuch an immoderate height, as expoſes the abſurdity of them to all men of common ſenſe; who out of indignation and an exceſſive renitence, not ſeparating that which is true, from that which is falſe, are apt to fall into the contrary extreme, a contempt of all Religion* [a].

Wollaston

And what better effect can we expect from your preſent *vindication of Scripture*, where, at every objection, you give the alarm; of *affronting God to his face*; *bidding defiance to the undoubted truths of God*; *running into downright blaſphemy*; *ſhooting up arrows againſt Heaven*, &c.? Your Adverſary *cavils at Circumciſion*; *it is fact*, you ſay, *that God did require Circumciſion, and who art thou that replieſt againſt God?* You tell us, that the *modeſt way* of oppoſing a *Revelation*, pretended to be *divine*, is not to examine the *internal* merit of its doctrines, but the *external evidence* of the fact [b]: but this is certainly loſing time, and beginning at the wrong end; ſince 'tis allowed on all hands, that if *any narration* can be ſhewn to be *falſe*; any *doctrine irrational* or *immoral*; 'tis not all the *external evidence in the world* that can or ought to convince us, that *ſuch a doctrine* comes from *God*.

No Revelation can contain any thing false, irrational or immoral.

For my own part, as I have no kind of intereſt to ſerve by the belief or eſtabliſhment of any opinion, beſides my private ſhare in the good it may do to the Publick, ſo it is the ſtudy and buſineſs of my life in every enquiry, whether *Civil*, *Natural*, or *Religious*, to ſearch for and embrace the *Truth*; or, where that is not certainly to be had, what comes the next to it, *probability*. And as in the preſent queſtion, 'tis my perſuaſion, that this way of *vindicating Scripture* cannot poſſibly do any ſervice, but probably much harm to the Cauſe you are defending; ſo I thought myſelf obliged by a regard to *Truth and the common Religion* we profeſs; to diſcourage, as far as I am able, the progreſs of a work, which is likely to be attended with ſuch ill conſequences: and if in *theſe Remarks*, (where I have endeavoured rather to ſhew the weakneſs of your reaſoning, than declare any ſentiments of my own) I have uſed any expreſſions of ſharpneſs or ſeverity, more than the nature of the Subject required, they are not to be charged on any envy to your merit, or ſpleen to your Perſon, but to an indignation raiſed in me, to ſee you *dictate ſo arbitrarily*, and *decide ſo dogmatically* in points of the utmoſt difficulty and uncertainty; and in queſtions where hardly *two Commentators* have ever agreed in the *ſame ſolution*, contemn all objections as *ſlight* and *trival*; as the meer effects of *ignorance* or *malice*; and beſtow the titles of *Fool*, and *Idiot*, on ſuch as differ from you in opinion, either of the *Authority or Interpretation* of the texts you are handling.

---

[a] Religion of Nature delineated, p. 60. [b] P. 64.

Yet after all, what *wonderful conviction* have you wrought; what feats have you done, towards *reſcuing the word of God from cavil and reproach?* In the *hiſtory of man's fall*, you have fixed an interpretation upon it, which Biſhop *Patrick* declares to be both *ſimple* and *incredible*. In the caſe of *Circumciſion*; inſtead of ſhewing *your Adverſary's ignorance*, you have betrayed *your own*; by denying that to be *painful or hazardous*, which for the *pain* of it was often *mortal*; nor allowing the *leaſt colour of reaſon* to an objection grounded in *probability*, and confirmed by *expreſs teſtimony*. Laſtly, in the ſtory of *Babel*, all that you have ſaid is little better than *jargon*; *unſupported by Scripture*; *contrary to reaſon*; and muſt needs appear ridiculous to all men of underſtanding.

Fall
Patrick
Circumcision
Babel

And now, Sir, I leave you to contemplate the merit of your great atchievements; a pleaſure which has, I'm afraid, been ſomewhat interrupted by the roughneſs of this Addreſs; and to ſhew my own impartiality, and that I am drawn into this controverſy by no other motive but a ſincere love to truth, and a ſincere reſolution to embrace it where-ever it is to be found; I ſhall proceed to uſe the ſame freedom with *your Adverſary*, by ſketching out a *Plan or rough Draught of ſuch an Anſwer* to him, as would in my judgment be the moſt effectual to confute and overthrow his whole Hypotheſis.

Light of Reason. Religion of Nature.

Reason a national Religion. The French have attempted the Experiment!

The Deſign of this *Author* is to ſhew, that the *Chriſtian Religion*, as 'tis now practiſed amongſt us, is not onely *uſeleſs*, but *miſchievous*; that the *Light of Reaſon*, or *Religion of Nature*, is the *onely Guide* we ought to truſt to; being *a perfect and complete rule of duty in all caſes, both towards God and Man*; and conſequently, that *Chriſtianity ought to be aboliſhed*, and *Reaſon* advanced in its place as the *Publick and National Religion*.

That this is the *main deſign of his Book*, there needs no pains to prove; 'tis evident to all who read it; and the *Author himſelf*, I dare ſay, will not deny it. On this foundation then, his whole ſcheme may eaſily be ſhewn, even upon *his own principles*, to be both *irrational* and *immoral*: *irrational*, becauſe *impoſſible to be reduced to practice*; *immoral*, becauſe, *if poſſible*, yet *pernicious and hurtful to the Publick*.

Reason insufficient to govern Nations. Laws and Religion necessary.

The firſt may be proved, by the teſtimony of all ages; which teaches us, that *Reaſon*, whatever force and ſtrength it might have in particular men, yet never had credit or authority enough in the world to be received as a publick and authentick Rule either of *Religious* or *Civil Life*; this is allowed by all the *great Reaſoners* of the *Heathen World*, and the experience of its inſufficiency as a *Guide of Life*, is given by many of them as the very cauſe of the invention and eſtabliſhment of *Religion*: that *the authority of the latter* [a], *might reſtrain thoſe whom the former had been found too weak to*

Cicero.

---

[a] Ut, quos ratio non poſſet eos ad officium Religio duceret. Cic. Nat. Deor. l. 1. 42.

I keep

keep in order. The life of man, according to Euripides [a], *was once like that of beaſts, governed by force and violence; laws were then contrived to repel injuſtice; but when theſe proved ſtill inſufficient, Religion was at laſt invented. By whoſe myſteries,* as *Tully* obſerves [b], *men from a ſavage life became formed and cultivated, as it were, to humanity.*

Euripides.

'Tis then a confeſſed *maxim of the Antients*, that *Reaſon* had not light or force enough to *guide mankind* in a courſe of *Virtue and Morality:* in conſequence of which we find in fact, from the *records of all Hiſtory*, that there never was a nation in the world, whoſe *publick Religion* was formed upon the *plan of Nature*, and inſtituted on the principles of *meer Reaſon*: but that *all Religions* have ever derived their Authority from the pretence of a *Divine Original*, and *a Revelation from Heaven.* This our *Author* himſelf in many places acknowledges, declaring, *that there never was a time or place without ſome traditional Religion or pretended Revelation* [c].

The Authority of Reason, not Stern enough to keep rebellious appetites and Passions in Subjection.

No time nor place, without a Revelation, real or pretended.

Such an *univerſal conſent* muſt needs be owing to an *univerſal conviction and experience of the inſufficiency of Reaſon*; and ſeems to be the *voice of Nature* diſclaiming it as a *Guide* in the caſe of *Religion:* and thus our *Author's Scheme*, by the confeſſion of *all Antiquity*, and even by *his own*, muſt appear *fooliſh and irrational*, in attempting to ſet up that for a *perfect rule of life*, which from the *nature of things* never was or could be received as ſuch in any age or country whatſoever.

Should he then gain his end, and actually demoliſh *Chriſtianity*, what would be the conſequence; what the fruit of his labours, but confuſion and diſorder; till ſome other *traditional Religion* could be ſettled in its place; till we had agreed to recall either the *Gods* of the *old World*, *Jupiter*, *Minerva*, *Venus*, *&c.* or with the *Idolaters of the new*, to worſhip *Sun*, *Moon and Stars*; or inſtead of *Jeſus*, take *Mahomet* or *Confucius* for the *Author of our Faith?* And hence may be demonſtrated the *immorality* alſo of *his Scheme*, even upon *his own principles.*

---

[a] Vid. Plutarch. de Placitis Philoſophor. l. 1. c. 7.

[b] Quibus ex agreſti immanique vita exculti ad humanitatem & mitigati ſumus. Cic. de Legib. 2. 14.

[c] P. 184. 229. Chriſtian. as old, &c.

For ſhould we allow *Chriſtianity* to be a *meer Impoſture*, on a level onely with all the *other Impoſtures* that have obtained in the world; it would not be difficult to ſhew from the *dictates of Reaſon*, that an attempt to overturn it, as 'tis now *eſtabliſhed by Law, derived* from *our Anceſtors*, confirmed by the belief and practice of *ſo many ages*, muſt be *criminal and immoral.*

Socrates

Cicero.

The *Moraliſts of the Heathen World*, tho' they clearly ſaw the cheat and forgery of the *eſtabliſhed Religion*, yet always perſuade and recommend a ſubmiſſion to it; well knowing what miſchief muſt needs befal the State by the ſubverſion of conſtitutions ſo greatly reverenced by the people. *Socrates*, when condemned to die on pretence of *ſubverting the Religion of his Country*, denies the charge, and appeals to all who knew him, whether he did not conſtantly comply with the *Publick Worſhip* [a]. And *Cicero*, as our *Author* himſelf allows, often *preſſes upon his countrymen a ſtrict obſervance of all the religious Rites eſtabliſhed by Authority*, and declares *all thoſe worthy of the laſt puniſhment, who ſhould attempt to diſturb them.* And tho' he was himſelf an *Augur*, yet he is ſo far from *diſſembling* on that account, as this man fooliſhly inſinuates [b], that he declares the whole *buſineſs of Augury* to be a meer fiction; and tho' it might have been *received at firſt on an opinion of its real uſe in Divination, yet when that opinion was worn off, it was wiſely retained for the ſake of Government*, and the *influence it had on the peace of the Republick* [c].

Cicero

---

[a] Xenophon. Apolog. pro Socrate.

[b] P. 396.

[c] Non ſumes ii nos Augures, qui avium reliquorumve ſignorum obſervatione futura dicamus. De Div. 2. 33.

Nec vero non omni ſupplicio digni P. Clodius, & L. Junius, qui contra Auſpicia navigaverunt—parendum enim fuit religioni, nec patrius mos repudiandus, &c. Ibid.

Exiſtimo jus Augurum, etſi divinationis opinione principio conſtitutum ſit, tamen poſtea Reipublicæ cauſâ conſervatum. Ibid. 35.

Ordiar ab Haruſpicina, quam ego reipublicæ cauſâ, communiſque Religionis colendam cenſeo. Ibid. 12.

The *Athenians*, upon rebuilding their City deſtroyed by *Xerxes*, enquiring of the *Oracle*, what *religious Rites they ſhould revive*, *were anſwered, ſuch as the cuſtom and laws of their Country had conſecrated* [a].

Protagoras

Epicurus

Euripides.

Diagoras.

The Philoſopher *Protagoras* having declared in a book of his, that as to *the Gods, whether they really exiſted or not exiſted, he had nothing to ſay*; the *Athenians baniſhed him* their territories, and ordered *his book to be burnt* [b]. And 'twas the *fear of the ſame puniſhment*, that reſtrained *Epicurus* from ſpeaking his mind freely on the *ſame ſubject*; and tho' he believed nothing of the *Gods*, yet obliged him in *words at leaſt to allow their exiſtence* [c]. *Euripides* too, as *Plutarch* informs us [d], *when for fear of the Court of* Areopagus *he durſt not openly ridicule the Religion of his Country, contrived to do it covertly under the feigned characters of perſons introduced in his Plays.* And when *Diagoras* went ſo far as openly to *deride their myſteries*, they proclaimed *a great reward to any one, who ſhould kill him* [e].

Theſe were the *maxims*, theſe the *principles*, which the *light of Nature* ſuggeſted, which *Reaſon* dictated; and from theſe inſtances our *Author* may ſee how *his Attempt* would have been treated by a people the moſt famed for *learning and politeneſs* of any of the *Heathen World*: It would have been thought *worthy of the laſt puniſhment*; *his book burnt*; *himſelf baniſhed*.

Deistical Cant.

And this may ſerve withal to ſhew his ignorance of Antiquity, in magnifying, as he does on all occaſions, the *moderation of Pagan Governments*, in oppoſition to *Chriſtian*; that they *indulged an univerſal liberty, never perſecuted for Religion, never*

---

[a] Cic. de Legib. l. 2. 16.

[b] Cic. de Nat. Deor. 1. 23. Protagoras, cum in principio libri ſui ſic poſuiſſet; de Divis, neque ut ſint, neque ut non ſint, habeo dicere; Athenienſium juſſu, urbe atque agro eſt exterminatus, librique ejus in concione combuſti. De Nat. Deor. l. 1. 23.

[c] Video nonnullis videri, Epicurum, ne in offenſionem Athenienſium caderet, verbis reliquiſſe Deos, &c. Ib. 30.

[d] Plutarch de Placitis Philoſoph. l. 1. c. 7.

[e] Διαγόρᾳ τάλαντον ἐπεκήρυξαν ἔι τις ἀυτὸν ἀνέλοι, &c. Joſeph. contr. Ap. l. 2. 37. it. Suid. in Diagor.

Atheists the most cruel Persecutors

Pharisees

Sadducees

quarrelled about their Gods [a]*:* for he quite miſtakes the matter; 'tis not the *Believers of Religion*, but *Infidels and Atheiſts*, who in every country have always been the *ſevereſt perſecutors*, and *cruelleſt oppreſſors* of all *Civil* as well as *Religious Liberty*. For as this life is their all, they are the more jealous in guarding it; the more ſevere in ſuppreſſing every innovation in practice or opinion, which might tend poſſibly to diſturb their repoſe; this is the conſtant obſervation of all who are verſed in hiſtory, eſpecially in that of *the Jews*; where the *Phariſees*, however *ſtrict* in the Obſervance of *their Religion*, were always *mild and gentle* in the *Seat of Judgment*; whereas the *Sadducees*, tho' little concerned for *Religion*, were moſt *implacable and rigorous animadverters on every ſlight tranſgreſſion of the Law* [b].

Christianity the nearest to Reason and Nature

Were *Chriſtianity* then to be treated as a *mere Impoſture*; on a level onely with the other *Impoſtures*, that have been received in the world; yet in this view we ſee plainly from the *dictates of Reaſon* and our *Author's own principles*, that an attempt to ſubvert it is both *irrational and immoral:* but ſhould we conſider it as the *beſt of all other Religions*; the beſt contrived to promote *publick peace* and the *good of Society*; and what *our Author* in his own book has demonſtrated, as coming the neareſt of all others to his *perfect law of Reaſon and Nature:* Then his crime will be aggravated in proportion, as he ſeeks to deſtroy a *better ſyſtem of Religion*, in order to introduce a *worſe*; ſince, as is ſaid above, ſome *traditional Religion* or other muſt always take place, as neceſſary to keep the world in order.

'Tis the tendency of actions, ſays he [c], *which makes them either good or bad: thoſe, that tend to promote human happineſs are always good; thoſe, that have a contrary tendency, always bad:* and this he declares to be a *never-failing rule, to judge of actions by their tendency* [d]*:* let's judge him then by his *own rule*.

Abolish Christianity!

The *tendency* of his book is to *aboliſh Chriſtianity*, and ſet up

---

[a] P. 101.

[b] Joſeph. Antiq. l. 13. 10. it. 20. 8. it. de Bell. Jud. 2. 8.

[c] P. 345.

[d] P. 350.

Reaſon in its place; the thing it ſelf is *impracticable*, the attempt therefore *fooliſh and irrational.*

Sett up Reason!

The *tendency* of it is to diſturb *the publick peace*, by overturning *a Religion* derived from our Anceſtors; eſtabliſhed by publick Authority; reverenced by the people; 'tis *miſchievous* therefore, and *dangerous to the Society.*

The *tendency* of it is to aboliſh a *rational* and *well formed ſyſtem of Morality*, to eſtabliſh a *leſs perfect one* in its place; 'tis therefore *criminal and immoral.* Thus without entring into *particulars*, or undertaking to *vindicate all the ſingle texts* excepted to, which can ſerve onely to *multiply cavils* and *perpetuate diſputes*, our *Author's general Scheme* may at once be confuted, and that by the moſt effectual and deciſive way of confutation, the conſequence of *his own principles.*

The general doctrine, which *our Author* profeſſes to eſtabliſh, is, that the *Chriſtian Religion is nothing elſe but a Republication of the Law of Nature, and cannot be true and obligatory any farther, than as it correſponds entirely with that original Law:* and for this he has produced the concurrent teſtimony of *all our principal Divines*, eſtabliſhing the ſame opinion as expreſly as he himſelf had done; and that they are ſincere in this declaration, and actually practiſe what they preach, he himſelf allows and effectually proves in many inſtances. *I have ſhewn you*, ſays he [a], *by a number of inſtances, where Divines themſelves own, that though the literal ſenſe of Scripture be ever ſo plain, yet it muſt not ſtand in competition with what our Reaſon tells us*, &c. And again, *Do not all interpret Scripture ſo, as to make it agreeable to the touchſtone of all Religion, the Nature and Reaſon of things* [b]?

Xtianity a Republication of the Law of Nature

Reason the first Revelation.

What's the meaning then of all this clamour? What is it that he quarrels at? Our *Divines* not onely agree with him in his *general principle*, but actually put it in execution, and reduce it to practice. Why, becauſe there are ſtill behind a *few things*, (mark the expreſſion, for 'tis *his own*) *a few onely, which their*

---

[a] P. 262.

[b] P. 425.

ſuperſtition has made them interpret otherwiſe [a]. This is the ground of all that ſpleen, which he ſo frankly exerts againſt the *whole order of Prieſts*; that tho' they agree with him almoſt in *every thing*, yet dare to differ from him in *any thing*; and preſume to interpret a *few things* ſo, as not to ſatisfy his *ſupreme and perfect Reaſon.*

Spleen v.t the order of Priests.

Candor, Equity, Benevolence and Charity

Here we ſee a ſpecimen of his *candor* and *equity*; here the fruits of that *benevolent principle*, that *charitable Religion*, which the *light of Reaſon* preſcribes; that *Governments muſt be diſturbed, Churches diſſolved, Prieſts proſcribed*, becauſe they will not in every point ſubmit to his *infallible Reaſon*. What he ſays of Dr. *Rogers* may much more juſtly be applied to himſelf. *The Doctor is againſt the Pope of* Rome, *but 'tis to ſet himſelf up in his ſtead* [b]. For the *Pope*, we know, indulges his followers in many *particular Superſtitions* of their own, if they will but ſwallow the *main and groſs* of his doctrines; but this *rational Proteſtant* will not ſuffer even *his Teachers*, tho' agreeing with him in the *main*, to diſſent from him in a *few particulars*. And *is not this*, to uſe his own words, *Popery, even worſe than* Roman *Popery* [c]?

Deistical Popery.

The *fundamental maxim* on which his whole attempt and all his hopes of ſucceſs from it ſeems to reſt, is, that *God cannot enjoin as a part of Religion, any arbitrary or poſitive precepts*, which do not directly flow from *the reaſon and nature of things:* or what comes to the ſame, that he cannot oblige us to any thing as a duty, whoſe *natural excellency and tendency to Morality* we do not immediately diſcover by *Reaſon and the Light of Nature*. This is the *main article* of his *rational Creed*; this the *ſingle point*, as he ſays, *that muſt decide the queſtion* [d]; for which reaſon I thought it neceſſary to ſpend a word or two upon it.

And here again, inſtead of ſquabbling with him about the real or comparative excellency of *the Precepts* he refers to, I ſhall purſue the ſame method, of turning *his own artillery* upon him, and endeavour by his own reaſoning to confute *this favourite*

---

[a] P. 347. [b] P. 306. [c] P. 307. [d] P. 114.

poſition of his; which may be done, I think, by the *very arguments* he makes uſe of to eſtabliſh it. Of which I ſhall produce two inſtances.

The firſt is an argument formed from the *ſimilar conduct of God* towards us, in the contrivance of his *viſible Works*, and of *his Laws*. *If God's Works*, ſays he [a], *ſhew infinite Wiſdom, there's no reaſon to imagine but that his Laws do the ſame*, &c. And in concluding the argument, *God forbid, that any of his Laws have not impreſſed on them the ſame character of the higheſt Wiſdom and Goodneſs, that is impreſſed on the whole frame of Nature, and on every part of it.*

Gods Works and Laws.

Now to prove any thing from theſe premiſes, the argument ought to run thus: *God forbid, that in the whole frame of God's Laws there ſhould not be the ſame proof of his Wiſdom as in the whole frame of his Works.* This is the onely concluſion that can be drawn from a compariſon of *his Laws* and *Works*; in which every rational Chriſtian muſt needs have agreed with him. But then this ſo far from proving what he infers from it, that it proves juſt the contrary, and overturns the *main principle* of his book. For though the wiſe of all ages have from the *excellency of God's Works* collected the *excellency of his Nature*; yet in thoſe *very Works, generally ſo excellent*, all ſtill agree, that there are ſome *particulars*, not onely whoſe nature, but whoſe uſe or reaſon of exiſtence cannot be diſcovered by the moſt curious ſearchers into Nature; nay, ſome things which, conſidered ſeparately, appear even *noxious* to the reſt; all which, tho' not underſtood, are yet reaſonably preſumed to be good and perfect in their ſeveral kinds, and ſubſervient to the general beauty and excellency of the *whole Syſtem*.

All discord, harmony, not understood.
All partial Evil, universal good.

The caſe, we allow, is exactly the ſame with *God's Laws*; which, though in general they demonſtrate the *infinite Wiſdom of their Author*, yet may in ſome particulars be ſo contrived, as that the natural excellency of them cannot eaſily be apprehended. For were it otherwiſe, 'tis certain, that God would act *differently* with us, in the diſpenſation of *his Works* and of *his Laws*, in both which this Writer contends for *the neceſſity of a ſimilar conduct*.

---

[a] P. 124.

'Tis then full as unreaſonable to charge all *poſitive precepts*, ſuppoſed to be from *God*, that is, all whoſe *uſe and relation to Morality we cannot comprehend*, to fraud and impoſture; as in the *viſible Works of God* to impute every thing we do not underſtand, or even every thing that ſeems *hurtful*, to the contrivance of ſome *malicious Power*, oppoſite to the *Divine Nature*. And as on the one hand we do not exclude from the *catalogue of God's Works* all thoſe particulars, in which we cannot trace the marks of *Divine Wiſdom*; ſo on the other, we cannot exclude from the *body of his Laws*, thoſe *few injunctions*, which ſeem not to have impreſſed on them the *legible characters of Morality*.

A ſtrange Aſsertion.

The ſecond argument is in the following paragraph, and runs thus. *'Tis impoſſible*, ſays he [a], *that men ſhould have any juſt idea of the perfections of God, who think that the dictates of infinite Wiſdom do not carry their own evidence with them; or are not by their own innate worth diſcoverable to all mankind: were it not ſo, how could they be diſtinguiſhed from the uncertain opinions of weak and fallible men? &c.* This indeed ſeems oppoſite to what the Scripture informs us of the *counſels of God*: that *his ways are not as man's ways, but unſearchable and paſt finding out*: and 'tis not contrary onely to *Scripture*, but to *Reaſon* too: for what difference could their be in *Nature* between *perfect and imperfect*; *finite and infinite* knowledge; if the *finite* could clearly diſcover every purpoſe of the *infinite*? Both *Reaſon and Scripture* teach us, that *God knows and ſees thro' the heart of man*; but no man's reaſon before this ever taught, that *Man knows and ſees thro' the heart of God*: that man, whoſe knowledge is ſo narrow even in the common concerns of life, can *fathom all the counſels, interpret all the laws* of an *infinitely wiſe Creator*. Thus his own argument turns againſt himſelf. *If the dictates of infinite Wiſdom*, ſays he, *are not diſcoverable to all mankind, how could they be diſtinguiſhed from*

---

[a] P. 125.

the opinions of fallible men? Whereas on the contrary, were it true what he contends for, it would be more difficult to *diſtinguiſh* them: for if all the *deſigns of God were as diſcoverable to man*, as *man's are to God*, he might well ſay, *where's the diſtinction?* But there's no one truth more certain, or flowing more neceſſarily from the *reaſon and nature of things*, that tho' *God* perfectly underſtands every purpoſe of man, yet that there not onely may be, but really are many things, effected by his power and ordained by his will, which *Man* is not *capable of comprehending*.

This is the ſubſtance of what I would propoſe for an *Anſwer to this Author*; which when explained more at large, and filled out by proper teſtimonies and authorities of other Writers, might be ſufficient to confute his *general Scheme*, as well as the *fundamental principle* on which 'tis built. But to ſhew farther, that whatever be the real excellency and perfection of *Reaſon*, yet *his reaſon* at leaſt is very *defective* and *imperfect*, and can have no pretence to ſet up for a *Guide in Religion*; many inſtances may occaſionally be interſperſed:

1. Of *his blunders in points of Hiſtory:* for tho' he often affirms, that *Heatheniſm never taught men to quarrel about Religion, except in Egypt*; nor *ever raged to that degree, as to occaſion bloodſhed, wars, and perſecution*; yet *Hiſtory* would teach him, that the politeſt people, as well as the greateſt lovers of liberty, of the *Heathen World*, the *Greeks*, had their *Holy Wars*, their *Solemn Leagues and Covenants*, as well as *Chriſtian Zealots:* particularly one againſt the *Phocenſians*, of which *Philip of Macedon* was choſen Head [a].

The Greeks had holy Wars and Solemn Leagues.

2. Of his *inconſiſtency* with himſelf; when at ſome times to blacken the *preſent ſtate of the Church*, he appeals to the *primitive Ages and primitive Fathers* as actuated by quite different prin-

Marvelous Inconsistencies.

---

[a] Demoſthenis Orat. contra Æſchin. p. 95. Edit. Foulkes & Friend. Incredibile quantum ea res gloriæ Philippo dedit; illum vindicem ſacrilegii, illum ultorem Religionum, &c. Juſt. Hiſt. l. 8.

Philip Vindex Sacrilegii, Ultor Religionum, Is not this good Popery? What more can You say of the Inquisition?

ciples of *piety and ſimplicity* [a]: at other times, to blacken the *whole ſtate of Religion*, he reflects upon *thoſe very Ages*, *held*, as he ſays, *for the pureſt*, as the moſt *impure and corrupt of all, and that the farther we go back, the more frauds we ſhall find* [b]. In the ſame manner, to make the *Chriſtian Prieſts* more odious, he repreſents the *Pagan and Mahometan Prieſts* as very Saints in compariſon; at leaſt as harmleſs innocent creatures, who *never did any miſchief* [c]. Yet at other times, to make the *very character and name of Prieſt* abominable, he declares them to be *all alike; all equally wicked; of all Religions the ſame* [d].

3. Of his *malice to the Clergy*; whom he deſcribes every where as an *Order of men, profligate and abandoned to wickedneſs; inconſiſtent with the good of ſociety; irreconcileable enemies to reaſon; conſpirators againſt the liberty and property of mankind* [e]: whilſt yet he ſhews by many inſtances, that the whole employment of their profeſſion is to *explain Chriſtianity ſo as to make it agreeable to the reaſon and nature of things*: as if thoſe could be *enemies to Reaſon*, who are conſtantly *preaching it up*.

4. Laſtly, of his *obſtinate perſeverance in errors*, once embraced: this appears from *his repeated charge of forgery on the Church, in the caſe of the 20th Article* [f]: tho' the charge has ſo oft been confuted and ſhewn to be groundleſs by ſuch undeniable evidence as can leave no farther room for ſcruples with any reaſonable man.

Thus, Sir, I have *ſketched out the rough draught of ſuch an Anſwer* to this Author, as in my judgment is the moſt likely to deſtroy his credit with all who pretend to reaſon: my comfort at leaſt is, that if it does no good, it cannot do any harm: whereas in your method of treating the controverſy, you run *too great*

---

[a] P. 109, 313, 319.

[b] P. 162.

[c] P. 108.

[d] P. 233, 282, 160.

[e] P. 47, 108, 160, 163, 164, 180, 241, 281, &c.

[f] P. 160.

a riſk; expoſe *Religion to too great hazard*; and engage on *too great odds* with your Antagoniſt. For ſhould he fail in his attempt, he loſes nothing but reputation by being baffled, nor hurts the general cauſe of reaſon by expoſing the weakneſs of his own. But the caſe is different with you; 'tis *the cauſe of Religion*, that reſts on your ſhoulders; and the ſucceſs of it in ſome meaſure depends, on the ſucceſs of your performance: for whilſt you excite the attention of the Nation to your *Vindication of Scripture*, ſhould that *Vindication* fail in any part, you ſo far expoſe the *Scripture itſelf* to contempt; give a real triumph to its enemies; confirm them in their infidelity; and inject probably new ſcruples where none had been entertained before. Leaving it therefore to your ſerious conſideration, whether you ought to proceed any further in ſo hazardous an undertaking,

I am, &c.

A
DEFENCE
OF THE
LETTER
TO
Dr. *WATERLAND*;

Againſt the falſe and frivolous Cavils of

The AUTHOR of the REPLY.

———*Fragili quærens illidere dentem*
Offendet ſolido——HOR.

A
DEFENCE
OF THE
LETTER
TO
Dr. *WATERLAND*, &c.

SIR,

'TIS with no ſmall reluctance that I have prevail'd with myſelf at laſt to take notice of *your Reply* to *my Letter to Dr. Waterland:* Your Criticiſms upon it are either ſo trifling, or ſo falſe, that I was perfectly ſecure of their making any impreſſion to my diſadvantage on men of ſenſe or learning: and as it has been my care, in what I have hitherto offered to the Publick, to conſult both the profit and pleaſure of my Reader, ſo I was loth to ſit down to a Controverſy unlikely to afford either; to diſpute onely about words, and ſquabble about the grammatical conſtruction of ſeparate Scraps and Quotations.

However, ſince nothing elſe that deſerves the leaſt attention has appear'd on the occaſion but *this Reply* of yours, which by the ſolemn gravity of its ſtile, and the air of authority it breathes, may poſſibly paſs with ſome for a learned and judicious performance,

mance, I have thought proper to give it a particular examination; eſpecially as it will afford me an opportunity of explaining myſelf more clearly in ſome points where, contrary to my intention, I may perhaps have given offence; and of opening by the way ſome queſtions of great importance, toward ſettling Chriſtianity on its true and natural foundation.

The clamour you raiſe againſt me is for *attempting to weaken the authority of Moſes*, and your Title page like an Alarm bell gives warning thro' the Nation of an Enemy gone out to lay waſte and deſtroy Revelation, and propagate Infidelity; and yet I defy you to ſhew any thing advanced in *my Letter*, for which I have not the authority of the beſt and moſt rational Apologiſts, both ancient and modern, as well of the *Jewiſh* as *Chriſtian Religion.* 'Tis not my deſign to deſtroy or weaken any thing but thoſe ſenſeleſs ſyſtems and prejudices, which ſome ſtiff and cloudy Divines will needs faſten to the body of Religion, as neceſſary and eſſential to the ſupport of it. For in this age of Scepticiſm, where Chriſtianity is ſo vigorouſly attacked, and as it were cloſely beſieged, the true way of defending it, is not to enlarge the compaſs of its fortifications, and make more help neceſſary to its defence, than it can readily furniſh; but like ſkilful Engineers, to demoliſh its weak outworks, that ſerve onely for ſhelter and lodgment to the enemy, whence to batter it the more effectually, and draw it within the compaſs of its firm and natural entrenchments, which will be found in the end impregnable.

You ſay, that *Dr. Waterland*'s *character as a learned and rational advocate for Chriſtianity drew down the weight of my wit and reading upon him, and that he had done too much good, not to receive ill at the hands of the favourers of Infidelity* [a]. But is not this both raſh and uncharitable, to aſſert ſo roundly what you cannot know to be true; that the ground of my quarrel to the Doctor is *the good he was doing Chriſtianity?* 'Tis poſſible, Sir, that my name may not always continue a ſecret, and whenever I ſhall have the honour of being known to you, if I be not thought incapable of quarrelling with any man for *the good he does*; and if my life be not found as exemplary and agreeable to the rules of the Goſpel, as that of the moſt zealous champion of you all; then will I allow every thing you can ſay or ſuſpect of me to be juſt and reaſonable.

---

[a] Reply, p. 6.

In the mean while I contemn your groundleſs charge of *Infidelity*; declare myſelf a *true friend to Chriſtianity*; which I am able, I think, to defend by principles much more rational and conſiſtent than thoſe you ſeem poſſeſſed of; as will appear very clear in the ſequel of this controverſy. And I muſt withal declare, that I have no quarrel at all to Dr. *Waterland*, but on the contrary a great reſpect for his known learning and abilities; am perſuaded onely, that whatever good he deſigned, his way of defending Scripture is very ſure of doing miſchief to the common Religion we profeſs: this I have ſhewn in *my Letter* to him by ſeveral inſtances, and could have ſhewn it in as many more had it been neceſſary, with no other view, than to divert him from purſuing a method of defence ſo dangerous to the cauſe he was vindicating: but ſince my Remonſtrance has made no impreſſion on him; and he has now thought fit to ſecond the blow he had given, tho' I am ſtill the more confirmed by his laſt performance in the ſentiments I had declared of the firſt, yet I ſhall hardly give myſelf or him any farther trouble, as it could ſerve onely to illuſtrate and ſpread the ſcandal already given, by collecting and pointing it out to the Reader; which I have no inclination to do any farther than I may be obliged to it by the Doctor or Yourſelf in vindication of my own credit and judgment.

In all Controverſies about Religion, the chief provocation to men of ſenſe is to ſee a ſet of raſh, dogmatical Divines, whoſe minds, prepoſſeſſed with ſyſtems, and darkened with prejudices, could never ſee thro' the miſts their Nurſes and Mothers had ſpread about their eyes, ſetting themſelves up for the onely guides and teachers of truth to the Nation; requiring the learning and reaſon of mankind to ſubmit to their arbitrary deciſions, and branding with the name of *Sceptick and Infidel,* all who cannot admit their manner of explaining and defining the terms of Chriſtian Faith. Such Divines as theſe are ſo far from acting up to the character they aſſume, of *Phyſicians of the ſoul,* by ſhewing any care to gild the pill they preſcribe, and temper their medicines to the ſtate and condition of the Patient, that they expect to treat rational creatures, as Farriers do their Horſes, tie them up by the noſe, and ſo make them ſwallow whatever they think fit to throw down: Theſe are the men I ſhall ever quarrel with, as the Tyrants and Oppreſſors of Reaſon and Conſcience, and conſequently enemies to the peace and happineſs of mankind.

But 'tis time to open the ſtate of our preſent Controverſy: *Your buſineſs,* you ſay [a], *with me is not to enter into diſpute about the Reaſonings advanced in my Letter, but to ſet before me and expoſtulate with me about the many falſhoods it abounds with, both in quotations and hiſtorical facts.* And here we ſee the firſt ſpecimen of your art and inſincerity; for tho' you pretend not to meddle at all with *my Reaſonings,* yet a great part of your performance is wholly employed in examining them: nor do you ever omit the leaſt opportunity of cavilling at them, as far as you dare venture, which is generally out of your depth, as we ſhall frequently ſee in the progreſs of this diſpute: But 'twas prudent to ſecure a retreat beforehand, that whenever you come to be puſh'd, you might ſhelter yourſelf under this previous declaration, that it was not *my Reaſonings,* but *my Quotations* you had undertaken to attack.

Again, as to the *many falſhoods of my Quotations,* you betray at ſetting out a ſtrange diſingenuity, for you undertake to *convict me of having hardly made one original Quotation of an Author in his true ſenſe, very often in a ſenſe moſt oppoſite to the true one* [b]. A compleat victory indeed! not to leave *one Quotation* alive! not to let a ſingle one eſcape, but to treat theſe *Rebels to Religion,* like *Catiline*'s *Rebels* to the State, mow them all down in the very ranks where they ſtand. But this is purſuing onely the old rule Calumny; *to calumniate ſtrongly, without any regard to truth, that ſomething at laſt may ſtick:* for tho' you wou'd prepoſſeſs the Reader with the notion, that I have not repreſented ſo much as *one Quotation truly*; yet out of about *fourſcore,* which are referred to in my *ſhort Letter,* all you pretend to criticiſe are but *fifteen*; and of this number *two* are thrown in merely to enhance the reckoning, and do not at all relate to *my Quotations,* but contain onely ſome cavils to *my Reaſonings.*

---

[a] Reply, p. 6. [b] Reply, p. 7.

Laſtly, as to the *many falſhoods of my Hiſtorical Facts,* which you proclaim me guilty of in your *Title page*; the whole number you conteſt with me amounts onely to *one:* and tho' to ſave your credit you would fain ſtretch it to *two,* yet your ſecond inſtance concerns no fact at all, but my ſolution onely of a fact, about which we both join iſſue, *viz.* the *Moſaic account of the Confuſion of Babel.* Is this agreeable to the gravity and character you aſſume of an Advocate of Chriſtianity? or can it do any good to the Cauſe of Religion to defend it by ſuch artful methods of Calumny; and in the very act of expoſing, as you pretend, my want of veracity, to give the real ſcandal of ſo notorious and wilful an inſincerity?

But to proceed to the examination of your ſeveral Criticiſms; which I ſhall take notice of in the order as they offer themſelves, neither evading nor palliating the force of any of them.

You begin your attack by charging me with four inſtances of falſification in as many examples of quotations made from *Cicero*; and accuſe me not onely of prejudice and partiality, but of quoting him for *ſaying what he really does not ſay*; nay, what he *diſclaims and declares againſt* [a]; and conclude by lamenting that this *Great Maſter of Reaſon ſhould have ſo unworthy a Follower as Myſelf.* This you confirm as to the two firſt inſtances, by ſhewing that I have imputed to *Cicero,* what he ſpeaks onely under the perſon of *Cotta* and under the fiction of a *Dialogue,* and what muſt not therefore be conſidered as his own opinion.

---

[a] Reply to the Letter, p. 9, 10.

But you muſt needs be little acquainted with *Cicero's Dialogues*, to imagine that under theſe feign'd characters he does not frequently repreſent his own real thoughts: *You will wonder*, ſays he, in his letter to *Varro*, prefix'd to his *Academick Queſtions*, *to find a Converſation deſcribed between you and me which we never held together*, *but you know the manner of Dialogues* [a]: and in the Preface of his *Book of Old Age*, he tells us, that he had aſſign'd the principal part to *Old Cato*, in order to give the *greater weight and authority to his own ſentiments* [b]. Now in this Book about the *Nature of the Gods*, whence my two Quotations are taken, *He* has inſtituted a *Dialogue* between three perſons, of the three different Sects of Philoſophy of moſt credit at that time in the world; *Velleius the Epicurean*, *Balbus the Stoick*, and *Cotta the Academick:* which laſt from the Principles of that Philoſophy undertakes to confute the Notions of the *Stoicks*, about *Religion* and the *Gods:* and does not every one who knows any thing of *Cicero*, know that he was of the *ſame Sect*; a conſtant Follower of the *Academy* in his real Judgment? ſo that if there be any thing in that *whole Dialogue*, which can be called *Cicero*'s *own* more peculiarly and properly than the reſt, 'tis the very part and character aſſigned to *Cotta:* for in his *ſecond Book of Divination*, where he diſputes in his own perſon, he takes the ſame ſide, and uſes the ſame arguments, which he had put here into the mouth of *Cotta*, to confute the opinion of the *Stoicks* about *Religion* and *Divination*. Where then does he diſclaim the paſſages I have quoted? why no where; but on the contrary in other places confirms them; and declares onely in general in the cloſe of this very Conference, that the *argument of Balbus or the Stoick ſeemed ſomewhat the more probable* [c]: which may well be looked upon as a compliment to *Brutus*, to whom he addreſſes this very book; for as *Brutus* was a *Stoick*, it was but a proper civility in a *Dialogue* dedicated to him, to give a ſlight preference to the Principles he profeſſed; as we find him to have actually done on another occaſion, in allowing the Philoſophy that *Brutus* followed to be the beſt [*a*], tho' himſelf was of a different Sect.

---

[a] Epiſt. Fam. l. 9. ad Varron. 8.

[b] Sermonem tribuimus non Tithono ---ſed M. Catoni ſeni quo majorem auctoritatem haberet Oratio.

[c] De Nat. Deor. l. 3. ad fin.

But you carry the point ſtill farther, and tell us, that the ſentences here quoted are ſo far from being *Cicero*'s, that they are not even *Cotta*'s; who owns at laſt, that all he had been ſaying was not built *on any certain judgment, but propoſed onely for argument's ſake, in which he was willing to be confuted.* And here whilſt you fancy yourſelf puſhing your adverſary, you betray onely your own ignorance: for every one converſant in Antiquity cannot but know, that it was the peculiar character and diſtinction of the *Academy*, *Nullum Jujicium interponere*; to deliver *nothing dogmatically*, to declare *no judgment* of its own; to follow onely the *probable*; and beat down every thing advanced as *certain or ſelf evident* [*b*]. *Cotta* therefore, tho' agreeably to the Principles of his Sect, he might wiſh to be confuted, that is, to have ſome greater degree of probability offered to him, than what he had before acquieſced in; yet muſt be ſuppoſed in the mean while to have embraced and approved the Sentiments he had been aſſerting in this Diſpute as the moſt probable.

Your Cavil to my next Quotation is ſtill more ridiculous, for tho' 'tis truly taken from *Cicero*, yet 'tis found there, you ſay, *in the mouth of an Objector.* Where I muſt own my ſelf puzzled to gueſs what you would be at: for you no ſooner ſtart the Cavil, than confute it yourſelf; telling us that *Cicero ſays the ſame thing in another place*, and in *anſwering the very objection acknowledges the truth of it* [*c*]: but is a fact then leſs true for being propoſed as an *Objection?* nay is there not the greater preſumption of its weight for being offered in that form? and if it be true, which is all I'm concern'd for, 'tis entirely the ſame thing, whether it be put as a *Queſtion*, *Anſwer*, or *Objection:* 'tis put, it ſeems, in *Tully* as an *Objection*, and 'tis put juſt ſo in my *Letter*; where I ſhall leave it in its place, without loſing more time about a Criticiſm ſo impertinent.

[*a*] Qui tum in Philoſophia, tum in optimo genere Philoſophiæ tantum proceſſeris. De Fin. l. 3. init.

[*b*] De Divin. l. 2. 3. Hæc in Philoſophia ratio contra omnia diſſerendi, nullamque rem judicandi, &c. Nat. Deor. 1. init.

[*c*] Rep. p. 11.

Your laſt inſtance of Falſification charged on me from *Tully*, is the mention of a *Dream of Alexander the great*, about *a Serpent's ſpeaking* to him, which *Tully*, I ſay, *makes merry with.* To this you give a double Anſwer: Firſt, That tho' *Cicero had laugh'd at ſuch a Dream, yet 'tis no more a conſequence than that my left hand is my right, that he would have laugh'd at the Story of a Serpent's really ſpeaking, when atteſted ſo credibly, as 'tis by Moſes.* Secondly, that in fact, *he did not laugh at the Dream at all, and that 'tis all a merry invention of my own* [*a*]. And ſo far I agree with you, that what he ridicules is not ſo much the extravagance of a Dream, a thing common with every body, as the pretended miraculous effect of it, and the fooliſh credulity of thoſe who look on ſuch Dreams as ſent from God. But I inſiſt upon it withal, that he laughs too at the fancy of a *Serpent's ſpeaking*, and that eſpecially when it had *its mouth full*; but as this was not the caſe of *Moſes*'s *Serpent*, you think it clear, that had he *met with the Story ſo well atteſted by the graveſt and moſt antient of all Hiſtorians, he muſt needs have believed it.*

This indeed is a curious and ingenious Problem, worthy the meditation of ſo judicious a perſon as your ſelf, whether *Cicero would have believed this Story or no:* and tho' I have neither leiſure nor inclination to diſcuſs it with you at preſent, yet cannot help offering a hint or two which may be of uſe in ſo important an enquiry.

Cicero then aſſerts on all occaſions, that our belief or opinion of things ought not to depend on *Teſtimony or Authority*, *but on the weight and moment of Reaſons:* condemns the *Pythagoreans* for their *Ipſe dixit*, or implicit faith in their *Maſter Pythagoras:* and declares it *unworthy of a Philoſopher or Man of Senſe* to appeal to

---

[*a*] Rep. p. 12, 13.

ſuch Witneſſes as may be ſuſpected to have falſified, or feigned the Facts they relate; and to ſhew the Truth of things by *extraordinary Events* inſtead of Arguments [*a*]. Theſe, Sir, were the Sentiments of *Cicero*, and I muſt leave it to your contemplation, whether a perſon poſſeſſed of ſuch notions could eaſily take up with a Story ſo ſurprizing and prodigious on the ſingle Teſtimony of an Author, who lived above *two thouſand years* after the fact, tho' he *pretended*, as you ſay, *to be inſpired*.

But ſince you have thought fit to call this Story again upon the ſtage, and vouch for *Cicero*, that he would have believed it on the *ſame good Authority that Jews and Chriſtians do*; pray tell us, Sir, after all, what it is that we Chriſtians are obliged to believe of it: Muſt we believe it to be all an *Allegory?* No; 'tis the *Allegorical Interpretation* that has drawn this clamour upon me of *weakning the Authority of Moſes*, and *favouring Infidelity*. Muſt we believe it to be all *Literal*? No; we are not allowed to do that, ſince there's certainly much *Myſtery* in it. What then are we to do? why, we are to conſider it neither as *Fact* nor *Fable*; neither *Literal* nor *Allegorical*; but *both* together: to interpret one ſentence *literally*; the next *allegorically*; the third again *literally*, and ſo on to the end of the Chapter; which like the very *Serpent* it treats of, is all over ſpotted and ſpeckled, here with *Letter*, there with *Myſtery*, and ſometimes with a daſh of both.

For inſtance; *God made Man*, we accept *literally*; but *after his own image* in a *figurative* or *metaphorical* ſenſe: that *God made Woman*, we believe *literally*; but out of the *Rib of Man* moſt interpret *allegorically: God planted a Garden or Paradiſe*; here Commentators are endleſly divided between *Letter* and *Allegory*; ſome will have it to be in *heaven*, ſome on *earth*, others in a

---

[*a*] Non enim tam auctores in diſputando, quam rationis momenta quærenda ſunt —nec probare ſoleo id, quod de Pythagoricis accepimus, quos ferunt, ſi quid affirmarent in diſputando, cum ex iis quæreretur, quare ita eſſet, reſpondere ſolitos, Ipſe dixit—De Nat. Deor. l. 2.

Hoc ego Philoſophi non arbitror teſtibus uti; qui aut caſu veri, aut malitia falſi, fictique eſſe poſſunt. Argumentis et rationibus oportet quare quidque ita ſit docere; non eventis, &c. De Divin. l. 2.

middle region between both. Again; *the Serpent was more ſubtle than any Beaſt of the field,* we underſtand *literally*; but this *ſubtle creature* no ſooner accoſts *Eve,* than he becomes an *allegorical Beaſt*; the *old Serpent*; the *old Deceiver, Satan.* Laſtly, as to the puniſhment denounced on the Offenders, *I will put enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy ſeed and her ſeed; it ſhall bruiſe thy head, and thou ſhalt bruiſe his heel*; 'tis all *Allegory,* all a great *Myſtery.*

Now is it not more rational to follow one uniform, conſiſtent way of Interpretation, than to jump at every ſtep ſo arbitrarily from *Letter* to *Allegory:* and if the *Letter* be found in fact contradictory to *Reaſon* and the notions we have of *God,* what is there left us but to recur to *Allegory?* for which we have the authority of moſt of the *Primitive Fathers,* and the beſt *Jewiſh Writers:* and the *allegorical way* of expounding was ſo far from giving ſcandal in former ages of the Church, that on the contrary, to ſlight it was looked upon as heretical and full of dangerous conſequences [*a*].

Philo, the moſt learned and orthodox defender of the *Jewiſh Religion,* treats this very Hiſtory of the *Creation and Fall of Man* as wholly *allegorical.* By *Paradiſe,* ſays he, *we may ſuppoſe ænigmatically ſignified the governing part of the Soul, full of various opinions, like ſo many Plants; by the Tree of Life, Piety towards God, the greateſt of Virtues, by which the Soul is made immortal: by the Tree of knowledge of Good and Evil, our common Underſtanding, by which we diſtinguiſh things contrary to each other in nature,* &c. And when he comes to the ſtory of the *Serpent*; *Theſe things,* ſays he, *are not like the fabulous Fictions*

[*a*] Propter has cauſas omnia quæ de Paradiſo dicta ſunt ſpiritualiter intelligentes Interpretes, quorum meminimus, dixerunt, quod diverſæ natæ ſint hæreſes a quibuſdam hominibus qui carnaliter audierunt, quæ de Deo et Paradiſo dicuntur, &c. Vid. Bibliothec. Patrum, per Marg. de la Bigue. Par. 1589. Tom. 1. p. 270.

Sunt inter Hæreticos qui contendunt minimè convenire, ut Vet. Teſtamenti ſcripta myſticè atque aliter quam de rebus ipſis interpretentur, &c. ibid. p. 409. c. 3.

of Poets and Sophiſters, but figurative or typical Leſſons of Inſtruction, inviting us to ſearch for the Allegorical Senſe, by the diſcovery of its latent and hidden meaning: in which whoever follows the moſt probable conjecture, will find the Serpent, as 'tis aptly called, to be the ſymbol of Pleaſure [a] *: &c.* whence he goes on to give the ſame *Allegorical* Interpretation of the whole, which I have done in my *Letter.*

Clemens of Alexandria tells us, that *all Writers, whether Barbarians or Greeks, who have ever treated of Thology, have induſtriouſly obſcured the beginning and origin of things, by delivering the truth in Ænigma's, Symbols, Allegories, Metaphors and ſuch like figures* [b]. And in another place, that the *whole Scripture is written in the Parabolical Stile* [c], for which he gives ſeveral reaſons.

Euſebius ſhews, that *Moſes*'s *Hiſtory of the Creation, of Paradiſe and the Fall of Man,* was delivered by him in this *recondite and ſymbolical way of learning*; and that *Plato,* (changing onely the names, as of *Paradiſe* into the *Garden of Jupiter,* &c.) has copied the whole Story, and *allegoriſed* it juſt as *Moſes* had done before him [d]; of which he gives likewiſe ſome other examples.

And that the *Primitive Writers* in general eſteemed *the ſymbolical or figurative interpretation of Scripture,* to be on many occaſions the onely method of *vindicating it,* is very certain and undeniable: for inſtance, the *Moſaic Laws* about *Animals clean and unclean* were conſidered by them as wholly *allegorical,* full of a *hidden and myſtical* meaning: *The Law,* ſays *Philo, accounts the Camel an unclean beaſt, becauſe tho' he chews the cud, he does not divide the hoof; now if we conſider this according to the outward Letter, 'tis hard to ſay, what ſenſe there is in it, but if according to the inward meaning, there is a moſt clear and neceſſary one, &c.* which he goes on to explain [e].

[a] Philo de Opificio Mun. p. 35, 36, &c.

[b] Strom. l. 5. Op. T. 2. p. 658. Edit. Potter.

[c] Παραβολικὸς γὰρ ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῶν γραφῶν, ib. l. 6. p. 803.

[d] Præpar. Evang. p. 343. Edit. R. Steph.

[e] De Agricult. p. 206.

When Moſes told *the People,* ſays *Barnabas, that they were to abſtain from ſuch and ſuch Animals*; *the Command of God does not import a real Prohibition to eat*; *but Moſes ſpoke ſpiritually, and by prohibiting Swine's fleſh meant onely to ſay, thou ſhalt not keep company, or join thy ſelf to ſuch Men, as in their manners are like to Swine*, &c. [*a*]

Clemens of Alexandria, Euſebius, Lactantius, &c. follow *Barnabas*'s interpretation: *Tertullian* goes further, and ſays, that *nothing is ſo contemptible as the Moſaic Laws about the diſtinction and prohibition of animal food:* and *Origen* ſtill more freely; *that if we take them literally, they are unworthy of God, and leſs rational than the Laws of Men, as of the Romans, Athenians, Lacedemonians*; *nay, that ſome of them are contrary to reaſon and impoſſible to be obſerved* [*b*].

Thus far then you muſt needs allow me to be orthodox; clear of any attempt either againſt the *Authority of Moſes*, or in *favour of Infidelity*; unleſs you will involve in the ſame crime with me the moſt pious and learned *Fathers of the Church*, and the ableſt Defenders of Chriſtianity in all Ages: Let us ſee how juſt your charge upon me is in the following Articles; particularly that of the *Jewiſh Circumciſion*; where you next examine what I have advanced in relation to *its divine Origin.*

You affirm in the firſt place, that *I think with the Author of Chriſtianity as old, &c. that Circumciſion was borrowed from Ægypt* [*c*]. But, pray Sir, where have I declared that I think ſo? All that I endeavour or intended to ſhew, was the raſhneſs and unreaſonableſs of thoſe Divines, who aſſert its *divine Origin* in a ſtile ſo *dogmatical and overbearing* as cannot fail of giving diſguſt to Men of candour and learning; not allowing the leaſt *colour of reaſon* to the contrary opinion, but treating it as the meer effect of malice and ignorance; a way of defence ſo contrary to good ſenſe and good manners, that the cauſe of Religion muſt needs ſuffer by it.

[*a*] S. Barnab. Epiſt. c. x. p. 30. Edit. Coteler.

[*b*] Vid. ibid. Cotelerii Not. 42.

[*c*] Reply, p. 13.

However, Sir, had I really thought, what you impute to me, 'tis not at leaſt in your power to convince me of an error, as we ſhall ſoon ſee by the weak attempt you make towards it. For in conſidering a Quotation of mine from *Joſephus*, you ſay, *'Tis plain that Joſephus does not ſpeak there of any Ægyptians circumciſed, but Prieſts onely; and that if I had tranſlated him right, my Argument would have been ſpoiled*; and that for your part, *you gather from what Joſephus ſays of Herodotus, that he underſtood Herodotus to mean that the Ægyptian Prieſts onely were circumciſed:* whence you form immediately an Hypotheſis out of your own brain; *that theſe Prieſts of Ægypt taught the Prieſts of other Nations to be circumciſed, on pretence that it was neceſſary in ſuch onely for the ſake, not of Cleanlineſs, as I render the word καθαριότητος, but of Purity, or internal Holineſs, juſt as it was among the Jews* [a].

But now, Sir, if the contrary to this be true in every particular; if *the Ægyptian People in general, and not the Prieſts onely were circumciſed*; if *Joſephus underſtood Herodotus in that very ſenſe*, and laſtly, if *Circumciſion* was uſed by them juſt as I have ſaid, *for the ſake of outward Cleanlineſs*, and not as your Criticiſm imports, *inward Purity*; what will you ſay for yourſelf; what excuſe will you make for giving me ſo much trouble? Will not the Reader begin to ſuſpect that with all this Gravity you are but a Pretender to Learning, without any ſound ſhare of it; that the Knowledge you are maſter of, is ſupplied from Scraps and marginal Citations, without any thorough acquaintance with Antiquity, or the Authors you refer to? and as oft therefore as you are engaged to treat a queſtion to the bottom, like a Man fighting in the dark, inſtead of beating your Adverſary, will oftner be found beating the Air and bruiſing your own Knuckles againſt Poſts or Walls? of which we ſhall ſee many an inſtance before I've done with you.

For ſuppoſe that I had allowed the very thing that you contend for; that the *Prieſts onely were circumciſed in Ægypt*; how would my Argument have been ſpoiled by it? Was it impoſſible for

---

[a] Rep. p. 15, &c.

Moſes, who was bred up among thoſe very *Prieſts*, and inſtructed in *all their Learning*, to have copied *Circumciſion* from them, and yet extend it further afterwards by impoſing it on the People too? but not to dwell on Hypotheſis, let us enquire into the Fact.

The Authors I have quoted, the oldeſt, who give any account of *Circumciſion* [a], *Herodotus*, *Diodorus Siculus*, *Strabo*, mention it always as a cuſtom common to the whole Nation, without giving the leaſt hint or reaſon to believe that it was confin'd to *Prieſts* alone. *Agatharcides*, as quoted by *Photius*, ſays expreſly that *all the Ægyptians were circumciſed* [b]: and *Suidas* hints the ſame in the word ψῶλος. *Strabo* indeed adds, what is confirmed likewiſe by other Writers, that the *Women were alſo circumciſed* [c]: which fully confutes your Notion, and ſhews the Practice to have been general.

A Queſtion indeed may ariſe about the obligation to it; whether it was of abſolute neceſſity or not to all; and there may poſſibly have been ſome diſtinction between *Prieſts* and *People* on this account: but that it was commonly and generally practiſed by all, can admit of no doubt from the concurrent Teſtimony of all Authors: and 'tis certain that as the *Jews* would receive none to the *Paſſover*, but the *circumciſed*; ſo the *Ægyptians* admitted none elſe to their *religious Myſteries* [d]; ſo that *Pythagoras* was forced to be *circumciſed*, to procure admittance to their recondite and *ſymbolical Learning*: whence 'tis probable, that it was conſidered as a kind of *religious Teſt*, which the Prieſts and all who expected any benefit from Religion or Office in the State were obliged more peculiarly to comply with.

The next point is, whether *Joſephus* underſtood *Herodotus* to mean that *Circumciſion was peculiar to the Prieſts*. And if it be true in fact, as is ſhewn above, that it was not *confined to Prieſts*, and that *Herodotus* has given no ground for ſuch a diſtinction; your notion muſt fall of it ſelf. *Joſephus* indeed, in the place referred to, may be underſtood of a peculiar obligation or abſolute neceſſity which the *Prieſts* were under to be *circumciſed* above all other Men; but on another occaſion, where he appeals to *Herodotus*, for affirming the *Ægyptians to be the Authors of Circumciſion to all other People, and even to the Jews*, he makes no other reflection upon it, than that of *ſuch things every one may ſay what he thinks fit* [a]. A modern Author, of more zeal than judgment, ſays on the occaſion; *Joſephus has taken notice of the words of Herodotus, but I could have wiſhed, that he had called him to account for them, and not paſſed them over ſo coldly—This did not become Joſephus, on other occaſions ſo ſtout an Advocate of the Honour of his Nation* [b].

---

[a] Jerem. ix. 25. neque Ægyptiis utilis eſt &c. Juſt. Mart. Dial. 192.

[b] Photii Biblioth. p. 1358. ex Agatharcide, c. 30.

[c] L. 17.

[d] Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 1. p. 354. c. 15. Edit. Potter. Vid. it. Cotelerii Not. in Barnab. Epiſt. c. 9.

Again, You ſay, that the *Ægyptians* did not uſe *Circumciſion*, for the ſake of *Cleanlineſs*, as I render the word καθαριότητος, but of *Purity:* an Obſervation wholly groundleſs; it being certain, that the main intent of the cuſtom was, not to make them more *holy or pure*, but more *ſweet and clean*; in order to prevent ſome bodily diſtemper or inconvenience frequent in thoſe warm Climates; which is alledged by Writers as the cauſe and natural reaſon of the ſame practice in all the neighbouring Countries [c]. But beſides; the Paſſage itſelf, as it ſtands in *Herodotus*, can ſuggeſt no other notion; and all others, who have ever quoted it, have taken it in the ſame ſenſe that I do; for 'tis ranked in company with ſuch Cuſtoms as relate ſolely to *external Neatneſs* or *Cleanlineſs* [d]; viz. the *waſhing themſelves twice each day, and as oft each night in cold water*; *the conſtant waſhing their Cups*; *their Veſtments*; *and the ſhaving their Bodies to keep them clear of Lice and other Vermin*, &c.

---

[a] Περὶ μὲν τȣ́των ἕκαϛοι λεγέτωσαν ὅτι ἂν αὐτοῖς δοκῇ. Antiq. l. 8. c. x. §. 3.

[b] De Repub. Hebræor. l. 2. c. 4. p. 70.

[c] Ægyptii, Æthiopes, aliique ex oriente populi rationes regioni vel religioni ſuæ proprias habuerunt, quibus diu ante tempora Abrahami ad virilium pelliculas præcidendas inducti cenſeantur. Nam Philo & alii circumciſionem inter gentes aliquas conſilio civili primùm introductam putant, ad præcavendam ſcilicet lepram aut carbunculum, e ſordibus ſub præputio latentibus oriri ſolitum, &c. Spencer de Leg. Heb. l. 1. c. 5. §. 4. p. 58.

[d] Vid. Herod. l. 2. 37.

But you ſtill blunder on and tells us, that the notion of the *Ægyptians* was juſt the ſame with that of the *Jews*, amongſt whom it was conſidered as an *Emblem of Purity* [d]: in which you ſhew as little acquaintance with *Scriptural or Jewiſh Hiſtory*, as you do with the *Ægyptian*: For 'tis clear from Scripture that Circumciſion was not given for the ſake of *Purity*, but as a *Sign and Seal of a Covenant* between God and his People; as an *outward Mark* to diſtinguiſh thoſe who were under that Covenant, from all other Nations whatſoever. This is the account we have of its Inſtitution as well from *Scripture* as the *Primitive Fathers. You ſhall circumciſe*, ſays *God to Abraham, the fleſh of your foreſkin, and it ſhall be a token of the Covenant between me and you* [a]

Abraham, ſays *Juſtin Martyr, received Circumciſion as a Mark or Sign, and not as of any efficacy towards Righteouſneſs or Holineſs as both Scripture and Fact itſelf oblige us to allow* [b]. And *Irenæus, That God gave it not as of any ſervice to Juſtice or Righteouſneſs, but for a Mark to diſtinguiſh Abraham's Poſterity* [c]. The Reader will make a proper Reflection on a Criticiſm grounded in meer miſtake both of *Jewiſh* and *Ægyptian Antiquity*.

But the Sting is, that *I think with the Author of Chriſtianity as old* &c. which is ſo far from being a Reproach whenever he thinks right, as he certainly does in ſome things; that it would be much more for your credit to do ſo too, than to ſpend your time and pains in maintaining *vulgar Errors and pious Prejudices* againſt plain Fact and Hiſtory: but if you would do me right, you ſhould repreſent me, as thinking with *Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Philo, Joſephus, Photius, Sir Jo. Marſham, Dr. Spencer*, and even *Calmet* too, whom you recommend to my peruſal; who, tho' he labours like yourſelf to ſupport the common Hypotheſis againſt Fact and Teſtimony, yet is ſo fair at the ſame time as to allow a

---

[d] Reply, p. 16.

[a] Gen. xvii. 11.

[b] Dialog. cum Tryph. par. 1. p. 184. Edit. Thurlb.

[c] Quoniam autem circumciſionem non quaſi conſummatricem juſtitiæ, ſed in ſigno eam dedit Deus, ut cognoſcibile perſeveret genus Abrahæ &c. Adv. Hær. l. 4. c. 30.

great colour of Reaſon; a *great ground of Probability* to thoſe who aſſert the contrary opinion, which is all that I have ever declared for.

We are now arrived at what you call my *Maſterpiece of Quotation*, viz. a paſſage of *Joſephus* referred to in *my Letter*, in which *I make him give up*, as you ſay, *the Divine Miſſion of his own Legiſlator Moſes* [*a*]. Here indeed you ſeem greatly moved, and employ all your Rhetorick to move me too; calling upon me in the moſt ſolemn manner *for the ſake of ſincerity to retract my raſh aſſertion, and to conſider the whole Quotation over again*, in which *there's nothing*, you ſay, *that even ſeems to deny the Divine Origin of the Law and the Divine Inſpiration of its Founder, but what ariſes from my Miſrepreſentation*; *that ſuch a thought was as far from Joſephus, as attention or ſincerity was from me* [*b*].

I am come therefore, Sir, in obedience to your call, to review the whole Paſſage, and to conſider very ſeriouſly and attentively not *the Tranſlation*, as you abſurdly call it, but *the ſhort Abſtract* I had given of the ſenſe of the place in a manner agreeable to the form of *a Letter*, in which an exact or verbal Tranſlation muſt needs have appeared ſtiff and aukward: and upon a moſt careful Examination both of the Original and my Account of it, I am ſo far from being ſenſible that I have miſrepreſented my Author, that I am the more clearly and perfectly convinced that I had before given his true Sentiments; and that *Joſephus* in the place referred to does not inſiſt on any *ſupernatural or divine Authority* of *Moſes*, but aſcribes all the great things done by him to his own *perſonal ſkill and management*, putting him on the ſame foot with *Minos and the other old Lawgivers of Greece*; and giving him the preference onely on the compariſon for *the ſuperiour Excellency of his Laws.* This, Sir, I will maintain againſt you or any Man elſe to be the Senſe of the Paſſage in queſtion; and if I fail to make it good, deſire at leaſt, that it may not be imputed to any inſincerity, but incapacity and mere ignorance of the *Greek Tongue*; ſince with all the Skill I am maſter of, I can draw out of it no other meaning but what I am going to explain: and I don't queſtion but to convince every ſenſible Reader, that 'tis not I, who would warp and force the Words of *Joſephus* to any meaning different from their own, but you; who being firſt warp'd yourſelf with prejudice, and prepoſſeſſed with Syſtems, which you hold ſacred and inviolable, cannot reliſh any Truth, but what you can bend and accommodate to thoſe previous Notions: But in order to ſet this Queſtion in a clear light, it will be neceſſary to inſert the entire Paragraph; where I hope the Reader will excuſe the tediouſneſs of a Tranſlation, which I am forced by your Cavils to preſent him with, deſiring onely, as 'tis a matter of ſome Importance, that he will give it a candid and impartial Attention. The whole Paſſage then runs thus.

[*a*] Reply, p. 16. [*b*] Reply, p. 21, 22.

Let us conſider then in the firſt place the Greatneſs of Moſes's Actions. He having gathered together our Anceſtors, after they had reſolved to leave Ægypt and return to their native Country, into a mighty Body, brought them with ſafety thro' many and almoſt inſuperable difficulties. For it was neceſſary for them to march thro' a Country without Water, and wide tracts of Sand; and all the while to fight their way thro' their Enemies, with their Children, Wives and Baggage to take care of. In all which Circumſtances he approved himſelf a moſt excellent General, a moſt wiſe Counſellor, a moſt true and careful Guardian of them all. He brought the whole Multitude to depend wholly on himſelf; and tho' he had them entirely obedient in every thing to his Command, he turn'd all this to no particular profit or advantage of his own; and in that very opportunity, which other Governors chiefly make uſe of, to eſtabliſh themſelves in Power and Tyranny, and with that view indulge the People in a looſe diſorderly way of Life: He on the contrary, in this height of Authority, thought himſelf bound to live religiouſly and piouſly and ſhew great Benevolence to the People; thinking by that means the moſt effectually to demonſtrate his own Virtue, and provide in the beſt manner for the ſecurity of thoſe, who had choſen him their Leader. His Intentions then being ſo laudable and his Actions ſo great, he juſtly believed that he had the Deity for his Guide and Counſellor: and having firſt perſuaded himſelf, that all he *was doing or contriving was agreeable to the Will of God, he thought it neceſſary above all things to inſtill the ſame notion into the People: ſince thoſe, who are perſuaded, that God overlooks their Life and Conduct, will not venture on any thing illegal or ſinful: Such an one was our Legiſlator, not a Sorcerer or Impoſtor, as ſome unjuſtly aſperſe him, but ſuch an one, as they boaſt Minos to have been among the Greeks, and the other Lawgivers after him: for ſome of them imputed their Laws to—but Minos aſcrib'd his to Apollo and his Delphic Oracle, either really believing ſo themſelves, or fancying by that means to make the People ſubmit to them the more eaſily. But which of them (Moſes or the others) has drawn up the beſt Body of Laws, and which had beſt pretence to be perſuaded of God's Aſſiſtance (or otherwiſe, which of them has hit upon the beſt and juſteſt Notions of a God) may be decided by comparing the Laws themſelves; of which 'tis now time to give ſome Account: There are then throughout the World infinite differences of particular Cuſtoms and Laws, which yet we may reduce to theſe general Heads. Some have thrown the form of their publick Affairs into a Monarchy; others into the power of a few or an Oligarchy; others into the Multitude or a Democracy: but our Lawgiver had no regard to any of theſe; but, if a Man may uſe an expreſſion ſo forc'd, made the form of Government he inſtituted, a Theocracy* [*a*].

This, Sir, is a faithful Tranſlation of the whole Paſſage in the cleareſt manner I am able to render it; and to ſhew the inſignificancy of your Cavils, I have in all thoſe places where you find fault with me, given the very turn and force to the expreſſion which you require: and yet there is not in the whole Paragraph one word in favour of the *divine Miſſion*, or *Inſpiration of Moſes*, in that ſenſe of it, in which 'tis vulgarly received; but on the contrary, all the Glory of his great Actions, as well as of his Laws, are aſcribed to *his own Virtue, Skill and Addreſs*. In the firſt Part, which contains a ſhort Abſtract or general Character of his Actions, we find not the leaſt hint of any *Miracle* or the *immediate Interpoſition* of God; we are not told, how the People muſt have been

---

[*a*] Cont. Ap. l. 2. c. 16.

the

cut in pieces, when overtaken by *Pharoah at the Red Sea*; had not God miraculouſly opened a Paſſage for them thro' the midſt of it: how they muſt have periſhed for want of Water; had not God for their Refreſhment made it *to flow out of a Rock*: how they muſt have ſtarved for want of Food in the Deſert; had not God in a wonderful manner *ſent it down to them from Heaven*: but the ſaving of them thro' all theſe Difficulties, thro' *want of Water*, *want of Food*, is here ſolely imputed to the Care and Conduct of *Moſes*, and wholly turned to his particular Praiſe; till we come to the place you chiefly inſiſt on; viz. that *Moſes with ſuch laudable Deſigns and ſuch great Actions reaſonably believed that he had God for his Guide and Counſellor*. And what is there in this to ſupport the Notion of ſuch *a particular Inſpiration*, as is commonly aſcribed to *Moſes*? What is there in this Perſuaſion of his, but what every good Man in the ſame Situation, muſt needs be perſuaded of too? A Magiſtrate convinced of the Being of a God and a Providence, and conſcious, that every purpoſe of his Heart intends the Honour of that God, and the Good of the People he governs, cannot help believing himſelf to be under the ſpecial care of the Deity. This flows from the very reaſon and nature of things, and can never be otherwiſe: God, as ſurely as he exiſts, muſt neceſſarily favour ſuch a Man, and every ſuch Man muſt as neceſſarily be convinced that God does ſo favour him. And this is all that *Joſephus* can mean; ſince he grounds the Perſuaſion *Moſes* had of being under the *particular Guidance of God*, not on any facts of *ſpecial Revelation* or *divine Inſpiration*, but *on the conſciouſneſs of his own upright Intentions*, backed by the great ſucceſs of his Actions. And ſuch a Perſuaſion will always have more or leſs influence on the Mind, as it falls in with a Conſtitution more or leſs inclined to *Superſtition* or *Enthuſiaſm*, (the peculiar Character of the *Jewiſh Nation*) which is apt to impute every laudable Thought, and every ſucceſsful Action to the ſpecial Suggeſtion and Aſſiſtance of Heaven. And we ſee from what follows, that *Joſephus* thought it poſſible for Lawgivers to be poſſeſſed of ſuch a belief, without any good ground for it; ſince he makes it a queſtion, whether the *Grecian Legiſlators were really perſuaded, like Moſes,* or onely pretended to be ſo, of *the immediate Aſſiſtance of Heaven*; but whether they were or were not, 'tis certain however at leaſt, that they could have no *real Inſpiration.*

But the Senſe I contended for is yet more clearly demonſtrated by what follows: *That Moſes having firſt perſuaded himſelf that every thing he was doing was agreeable to the Will of God, thought it neceſſary above all things to inſtil the ſame Notion into the People*; becauſe ſuch a Notion inſtilled would naturally engage them to be better Men and better Subjects. Now if all is to be taken literally, juſt as 'tis repreſented in the Sacred Scriptures, what occaſion could there be for any ſuch care or thought of *Moſes* about *propagating this Notion among the People?* The thing muſt have been done to his hands without any contrivance of his at all: the Miracles he daily wrought muſt neceſſarily convince the People of it: who could not ſee *the Glory of God deſcending and talking with him* ſo oft in the midſt of them, without knowing that *every thing he did was agreeable to the Divine Will.* As *Joſephus* therefore in this place imputes the *inſtilling this Notion* into the People to the *Skill and Addreſs of Moſes,* he could not intend to perſuade us that this was done by the help of *real Miracles,* for they leave no room for any ſuch Management or Addreſs, but do the buſineſs of themſelves without it; but by *pretending to Miracles* where there really were none, and *deceiving the People* by a ſhew of ſomething like them into an opinion that they were actually done. This is the Method, that all other *Lawgivers* in the World have ever taken, as oft as they have wanted or *thought it neceſſary to inſtil the ſame notion into the People*; and 'tis indeed the onely Method it can be done by, ſince if any one had the *actual power of Miracles,* he could have no occaſion to project or think at all about it; the thing muſt neceſſarily follow of courſe; and by a conſtant ſeries of miraculous Events, the Notion obtain of itſelf among the People.

But to obviate all offence, which I have no intention to give, I muſt beg the Reader to remember always and take along with

him,

him, that I am not declaring here any Sentiments of my own, or examining what was the true Fact and real Caſe of *Moſes*; but what *Joſephus*, from the Paſſage we are now conſidering, muſt neceſſarily either think himſelf, or deſire that others ſhould think of it; which will be more clearly explained ſtill by what follows.

Such an one, ſays he, *was our Legiſlator*, *not a Sorcerer*; that is, not one, who did the Miracles he pretended to by any magical Art or infernal Power: *nor an Impoſtor*; who uſed the pretence of Miracles to cheat and deceive for his own Gain or Advantage; but *juſt ſuch an one as the Greeks boaſt their Minos, and other Lawgivers to have been, who aſcribed the invention of their own Laws to the Gods:* And here you lay, I find, a great Streſs on the Word *boaſt*, ἀυχοῦσι, as if it gave a contrary turn to the Senſe, from what I have repreſented, and carried in it the Notion of Falſhood and Lying; and that *Joſephus* intended to ſignify, *that Moſes really was, what they boaſted onely*, or *falſely pretended their Lawgivers to be* [a]: A Diſtinction childiſh and ridiculous! ſince 'tis certain both from the uſe of Language and common Senſe, that the word *boaſt* or *brag of*, as 'tis applied here to Men famous and excellent in their Generations, can have no other Signification than to *be proud of*, or *celebrate with Praiſe*; and the full Import of the Sentence is, that *Moſes was ſuch an one as Minos, and the other Legiſlators, whom the Greeks are ſo proud*, or *make ſuch a boaſting of*.

And, pray Sir, after all, what is it that the *Greeks boaſt ſo much of* in theſe very Men? Is it that they were *really inſpired* by the Gods in the Contrivance of their Laws? No, there was hardly a *Greek* of Senſe, who ever believed it; or had their Laws been dictated by the *Delphic Oracle*, would have believed it the more for that; as I could eaſily ſhew from Antiquity: All that they boaſted and admired ſo much in them, was, that after they had contrived an excellent Body of Laws, they had the Addreſs to perſuade the People, that *thoſe Laws were dictated by the Gods*; that under the Influence of ſuch a Perſuaſion they might ſubmit to them the more willingly. Do not the *Roman Writers* boaſt highly of their *Numa*, as of an excellent Prince and wiſe Lawgiver; and for Proof of his Wiſdon do not they tell us the Contrivances he uſed to inſtil the Notion into the People, that his *religious Inſtitutions were ſuggeſted by the Gods?* But they were not ſo ſilly as to believe the Fact itſelf to be true: that he *really was inſpired by a Goddeſs*, or received the *Ancile or holy Shield from Heaven:* Theſe things they celebrate as the Inſtances of his Skill and Policy, in order to procure the greater Reverence to his Laws: And ſuch an one *Joſephus* in this Place deſcribes *Moſes* to have been: Juſt as *Diodorus Siculus* had done before him; whoſe Words, as they are very much to our preſent Purpoſe, I cannot forbear inſerting: *The ſame kind of Fiction*, ſays he, *is ſaid to have been uſed in many other Nations, and to have been the occaſion of much good to thoſe who believed it. Among the Arimaſpi, Zathrauſtis pretended to have received his Laws from a good Spirit or Genius; among the Getæ, Zamolxis from the Goddeſs Veſta; among the Jews, Moſes from the God called, Iao: Whether imagining that every Invention or Thought beneficial to Mankind was really wonderful and divine, or that the Multitude out of regard to the Excellence and Power of the ſuppoſed Authors of their Laws would be the more readily induced to obey them* [a].

---

[a] Reply, p. 21.

But in the next Words, *Joſephus*, you ſay, *puts a wide difference between the Jewiſh and all other Lawgivers:* And ſo I own he does, by affirming *Moſes's Laws to be much better than theirs*; which he proceeds to demonſtrate by a Compariſon of the Particulars: and from this ſuperior Excellency of his Laws he infers a ſuperior Right to propagate *the Notion of their coming from God:* ſo that his Argument runs thus: *Moſes was no Magician or Impoſtor; but a wiſe and excellent Man, juſt ſuch an one as Minos and the other Lawgivers of Greece; theſe imputed their Laws to the Gods, as Moſes had done before them; but Moſes had a much better*

---

[a] Biblioth. Hiſt. l. 1. p. 84. Edit. Laur. Rhodom.

right to do ſo than they, becauſe his Laws are much better than theirs. Every one will ſee the force of this Reaſoning; for whoever is conſcious to himſelf, that he has formed the beſt Body of Laws, has certainly the beſt pretence either himſelf to imagine, that he had the *Aſſiſtance of God in them*; or to deceive the People with the Notion of his being ſo aſſiſted: for as the ſole end of ſuch Deceit is the *Good of the People*, he muſt needs have the beſt Title to make uſe of it, who had the *greateſt Good* to propoſe.

But the laſt Article of *this Maſter-piece of Quotation* is ſtill the ſtrongeſt towards clinching the whole, to the Senſe I have been eſtabliſhing: for 'tis ſaid, we ſee, that *Moſes in projecting a frame of Government for his People, had no regard to any other kind then ſubſiſting in the World, whether Monarchy, Oligarchy, or Democracy, but made his Government a Theocracy:* Now this is a ſhort Explication of all that went before: for how is it in the power of any Mortal to make a *Theocracy?* Is it poſſible for a Prince or State, by calling upon or devoting themſelves to God, to engage him to take upon himſelf the *abſolute*, *immediate*, and as it were *perſonal Direction* of their particular Affairs? Yet this, we ſee, is aſcribed to *Moſes*, that he *made a Theocracy*, which, as far as it was his pure Act and Deed, as 'tis here deſcribed, can bear no other Senſe, than that he managed matters ſo, as to perſuade the People that every thing ordered or effected by publick Authority, was done by the *immediate Appointment and Direction of God.* This muſt needs have been *Joſephus's Notion of the Jewiſh Theocracy*, as far as we can collect it from his Words; let's apply it then to a particular Inſtance.

Moſes was to build a *Tabernacle* or Houſe of publick Worſhip for the People: What was then to be done? Why, if as in other Countries he had been a *Monarch*, he would have called for his Workmen, pitched upon a Plan and ordered the Work to be executed: or had he been the Preſiding Magiſtrate in a Commonwealth, would have done the ſame thing with the Conſent and Authority of the People: But he had made his Government a *Theocracy*; and 'twas *God* therefore who muſt name the Workmen: and *God,* we read, accordingly pitched upon *Two*, the moſt famed, we may imagine, for their Skill in Building and all kinds of Workmanſhip [a]: For as *Joſephus* ſays of this very Fact; *God choſe the very ſame Perſons, which the People would have done, had the Choice been left to them* [b]. What then do the Workmen do? Why in any other State, under the Inſpection of the Magiſtrate, they would have formed a Model of their Work, and contrived the Patterns of all its Veſſels and Furniture; but as this was a *Theocracy*, they durſt project nothing of themſelves, durſt not venture on making even a *Table* or *Candleſtick*, but by the *immediate Order of God,* and a *Pattern given from Heaven.*

This was the *Theocracy* that *Moſes* contrived; where you, Sir, may believe if you pleaſe, that with all his Wiſdom he was not able to direct the building a Chapel; nor the beſt Workmen in his Camp to make a *Candleſtick and Snuffers* but by *divine Inſpiration*, and after a *Model given by God:* But you muſt not expect to perſuade us, that *Joſephus* believed ſo too: ſince the contrary is very evident; and that he had a mind at leaſt to leave a liberty and latitude in explaining the manner of this *Theocracy.*

Upon the whole; had you known how to expound a Paragraph rationally, by conſidering the general Senſe of the whole, and then connecting one part with the other; you might have ſaved me much Trouble and yourſelf the Shame of expoſing your want of Judgment by ſuch ſenſeleſs Cavils: and inſtead of this Outcry againſt me, muſt have praiſed rather the Temper and Modeſty of the Inference I draw, in recommending onely *more moderate and qualified Sentiments of the divine Inſpiration of Moſes*, than what are vulgarly received: for according even to your own Interpretation, does not *Joſephus*, in the Paſſage juſt recited, uſe much more Reſerve and Caution in aſſerting the *marvellous and ſupernatual* part of *Moſes's Character*, than what his *literal Hiſ-*

---

[a] Exod. xxxi. 2, 6. it. xxxvi. 1.

[b] Ὃυς καὶ τὸ πλῆθος ἆν ἐπιλέξατο, τῆς ἐξουσίας ἐπ' ἀυτῷ γενομενής. Antiq. l. 3. c. 6.

tory does? And if ſo; the Inference is certainly juſt, that it might be a hint to us, to uſe the ſame *Reſerve and Moderation* too in thinking and ſpeaking on the ſame Subject.

But you ſay, *that Joſephus in this place was as far from the thought of any ſuch Inference as I make, as Attention or Sincerity was from me when I read it; and if ever I had read his Jewiſh Antiquities, I muſt know that he never repreſents the Law but as given to the Jews by God himſelf, thro' the hand of Moſes* [a]. I have read his *Jewiſh Antiquities*; and from that very reading have collected the contrary; that his real Sentiments of the *divine Inſpiration of Moſes* were very little different from what is repreſented above. For tho' he undertakes in that Work to deduce and connect a *perpetual Hiſtory of the Jews* from the beginning of the World, as 'tis found in *the ſacred Records of the Old Teſtament*; yet he takes ſuch liberty with many of the facts there recorded, by *ſuppreſſing* ſome, *altering and accommodating* others to the ordinary Taſte and common Senſe of Mankind, as he neither could or durſt have done, had he believed them to have been *really and ſtrictly effected by God* in the very manner as the *literal Text* imports: to give one Inſtance out of many.

After his account *of the Paſſage of the Iſraëlites thro' the Red Sea*, he ſubjoins this Reflection: *I have given every particular of this Story juſt as I found it in the Sacred Books: but let no Man be ſurprized at the ſtrangeneſs of it, that ſuch an ancient and innocent People ſhould find a way opened for their eſcape thro' the Sea, either by the ſpecial Will and Interpoſition of God, or the accidental Concurrence of Natural Cauſes. Since in a like caſe as it were of yeſterday the Pamphylian Sea retired before Alexander of Macedon, and opened him a Paſſage, where there was no other way for him, when God had a mind to put an end to the* Perſian *Empire. And this is affirmed by all who have written of his Actions. But for theſe things, let every Man take them in what Senſe he beſt likes* [b].

---

[a] Reply, p. 22.

[b]—Εἴτε κατὰ βούλησιν θεȣ̃ εἴτε κατ᾽ αὐτόματον, &c.—περὶ μὲν τούτον ὡς ἑκάϛῳ δοκεῖ διαλαμϐανέτω. Antiq. lib. 2. c. 16. Ed. Hudſon.

Now 'tis impoſſible that he could have left it in doubt, whether this Fact had any thing *miraculous* in it or not, had he entertained any firm and certain belief of the *abſolute and univerſal Inſpiration of the ſacred Writings*, which repreſent it as one of the moſt *ſignal and illuſtrious Miracles* that *God* ever wrought by the hand of *Moſes*.

To the Authority of *Joſephus* I ſhall juſt add that of *Philo*; whoſe Words, as quoted by *Euſebius*, may be render'd thus: *As for the Man, whoever he was, who gave them their Laws, they had him in ſo great Admiration, that whatſoever he approved, they approved too. Whatever therefore he dictated to them, whether he had contrived and invented it himſelf, or had received it from the Deity, they imputed it all to God* [a].

I ſhall make no Reflection on this Paſſage, but leave it to the Reader to conſider, whether it is not more reaſonable, with *theſe primitive and judicious Apologiſts of the Jewiſh Religion*, to allow ſome liberty of thinking, as to the *Divinity of their ſacred Books*, than with our modern Zealots to calumniate and perſecute for ever all who differ from them in Opinion about Queſtions of ſuch Difficulty and Uncertainty; yet no ſooner does a Man enquire with Freedom into the true State of any *Scriptural Fact*, but the *Alarm Bell* is ſounded, and the Clergy admoniſhed of a dangerous Attempt againſt the *Authority of Moſes*. But conſider, Sir, that the effectual way of ruining a Fabrick, is to charge it with a greater Load than it was made to bear; and the ſureſt Method of weakening any thing is not by reſtraining it within its due Bounds, but by forcing and ſtretching it beyond what Nature and Reaſon deſigned it for. Now becauſe this is a Queſtion of great Nicety and Importance, which you ſeem not much acquainted with, it may be worth while to open it a little further, and add a Word or two more before I diſmiſs it.

---

[a] Ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν ἄνδρα ἐκεῖνον ὅς τίς ποτε ἦν ὁ τοὺς νόμους καὶ αὐτοῖς θεὶς, οὕτω σφόδρα ἐθαύμασαν, ὡς ὅτι δήποτε ἔδοξεν ἐκείνῳ καὶ αὐτοῖς· εἴτε οὖν λελογισμένος αὐτὸς, εἴτε ἀκούων παρὰ δαίμονος ἔφρασε, τοῦτο ἅπαν εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἀνάγειν. Euſeb. Præpar. Evang. l. 8. ex Philone de exitu ab Ægypto.

'Tis the common Notion of all the *Greek Fathers*, that the divine *Plato* had greatly ſtudied the *Books of Moſes*, and made much uſe of them in his own: So that *Clemens of Alexandria* and others call him the *Attick Moſes* [*a*]: and both *Clemens* and *Euſebius* take much pains in pointing out the particular Notions and Sentiments which he had borrowed from *Moſes* [*b*]. As we have ſeen then already from ſome Paſſages above what is delivered of the Character and Abilities of the firſt *Moſes*; ſo let us ſee likewiſe what this *Attick Moſes* ſays of the proper Qualifications and Perfections of *ſuch a Lawgiver*. Why he ſays, *that he ought to conſider and contrive nothing elſe ſo much, as to inſtil ſuch Notions into the People as are likely to do them the greateſt good* [*c*]. And this is exactly agreeable to the Character of *Moſes*, as 'tis given almoſt in the very Words of *Plato* by the *Jewiſh Writers* as well as *Primitive Fathers.* But in order to execute his good Intentions towards the People, *the Magiſtrate or Legiſlator will often find it neceſſary*, according to *Plato*, *for the good of his Subjects, to invent certain Fables, Fictions, or political Lies, to be propagated among them, as Medicine or Phyſick to obviate and cure ill Principles, as well as to infuſe good ones:* and above all, *to influence the Minds of the younger Sort ſo, as to make them ſubmit willingly and chearfully to the Laws preſcribed.* And to ſhew how readily the Multitude may be drawn into the Belief of any thing propoſed by an artful Governor, he inſtances in the *Fable of the Dragon's Teeth ſown in the Ground, from each of which an armed Man immediately ſprang up*; which, as abſurd as it is, was yet once, he ſays, *ſwallowed for true by the People* [*d*].

Now the chief End propoſed by *Plato* for the Invention of theſe *Fables* or *Lies*, is to keep the People the more religiouſly attached to an exact Obſervance of their Laws, and Obedience to their Governors. And this is what *Joſephus* every where inſiſts on, as the *peculiar Praiſe and Character of Moſes* above all other Law-givers in the World: that he had his People from their very Childhood trained to *the moſt inviolable Devotion to his Laws, and the moſt profound Reverence for his Perſon* [a]. Now ſhould I take the liberty to ſay, that *Plato*'s Notion of the uſe and neceſſity of *Publick Fables* or *Lies*, was borrowed from the *Moſaic Writings*, and ſuggeſted by what he had obſerved in the *Practice and Example of Moſes*, what an Outcry would the ſhallow Bigots make of *weakening his Authority*, and *favouring Infidelity?* Yet *Clemens of Alexandria* and *Euſebius*, I find, ſay much the ſame thing, and make this Reaſoning and theſe very Sentiments of *Plato* a clear Proof of his Acquaintance with the *Moſaic Hiſtory*.

[*a*] Νουμήνιος δὲ ὁ Πυθαγόρειος, ἄντικρυς γράφει, τί ἐστὶ Πλάτων, ἢ Μωσῆς ἀττικίζων. Strom. l. 1. c. 22. Edit. Potter.

[*b*] Vid. Clem. Alex. ibid. c. xxv. &c. It. Præpar. Evang. Euſeb. l. 12. &c.

[*c*] Ὥστε οὐδὲν ἄλλο αὐτὸν δεῖ σκοποῦντα ἀνευρίσκειν, ἢ τί πείσας μέγιστον ἀγαθὸν ἐργάσαιτο ἂν πόλιν. De Leg. 2. p. 664.

[*d*] Vid. Plat. de Repub. l. 3. p. 414. et alibi. it. de legib. l. 2. p. 663.

Clemens ſpeaking of the *Art of Governing*, tells us among other things, that the *ends of Government are to be ſerved by perſuading, or forcing, or injuring—or doing what is juſt, or lying, or telling Truth, as different Circumſtances require; Examples of all which,* ſays he, *and how to uſe each of them properly, the* Greeks *to their great Advantage have borrowed from* Moſes [b].

Euſebius after having explained *Plato*'s Opinion about the Neceſſity of contriving *proper Fables and Fictions* for the Good of the People, declares the Caſe to have been juſt the ſame with the *Jews*, and that in *the Books of* Moſes *there are infinite Examples of this kind of Fictions contrived for the Benefit of the Multitude* [c].

But is the Notion then, you'll ſay, of the *Divine Origin of the Law and Inſpiration of Moſes* to be reſolved into *Fiction* and *Fable* or *Political Lying?* No; far be it from me to think or ſay that: But this perhaps one may venture to ſay; that the Suppoſition of ſome degree of *ſuch Fiction* may poſſibly be found neceſſary to the ſolving the Difficulties of the *Moſaic Writings*, without any hurt to their Authority, or advantage to Infidelity; ſince the beſt and moſt zealous Apologiſts of the *Jewiſh Religion* have not ſcrupled, we ſee, to allow it on ſome occaſions; eſpecially when it was their buſineſs to explain and propoſe it to Strangers; not with any deſign to *weaken*, but to *ſtrengthen* it the more effectually in the good Opinion of the World; by ſhewing its *Founder Moſes* to have been the ſame kind of Man with thoſe other *Legiſlators* and *Founders of States*, for whom the politeſt Nations have always had the utmoſt Honour and Veneration. For *there's nothing diſhonourable*, ſays *Plutarch, in the common Story of Lycurgus, Numa, and other ſuch Lawgivers; that having great Innovations to make in the State, and a perverſe and obſtinate People to deal with, they invented the Fiction of a divine Miſſion or Revelation, ſalutary and beneficial to thoſe for whoſe ſake they contrived it* [a].

---

[a] Vid. Antiq. l. 3. c. 15. Sect. 3. It. con. Ap. l. 2.

[b] Strom. 1. p. 417. Edit. Potter.

[c] Præp. Evangel. p. 356. Edit. R. Steph.

But to return into the way from whence we have digreſſed. You go on to expoſe *my manner of miſquoting*, as you call it [b], in ſome Paſſages I had produced from *Herodotus*; and affirm, that I have *partially quoted him on purpoſe to deceive my Reader no leſs than five times in about twice the number of lines* [c]. Let us examine the Truth of this ſolemn and heavy Accuſation.

Firſt then, I quote *Herodotus* for ſaying, that *the Ægyptians were governed by Laws and Cuſtoms peculiar to themſelves and different from thoſe of other Nations.* This, you own, is *Truth, but not the whole Truth*; for *Herodotus ſays, that their Laws were different from thoſe of all other Nations. But I judged it neceſſary*, it ſeems, *to drop the word all, leſt the Reader ſhould perceive the Abſurdity of attempting to ſhew from this Place that the Jews agreed with them in their Cuſtoms* [d]. Sure no Cavil was ever ſo trifling: For is not the Word *all* of neceſſity implied and underſtood in the very Senſe I have given? If the *Ægyptian Laws* were, as I ſay, *peculiar* to themſelves, does not that *Peculiarity* infer a Difference from *all* other Nations? But ſuppoſe the Word *all* not implied onely, but actually inſerted; how does it ſhew any Abſurdity in my Reaſoning, or at all affect it? My Argument previouſly ſuppoſes ſome Reſemblance of Cuſtoms between the *Jews* and *Ægyptians*, grounded on the long Reſidence of the *Jews* in *Ægypt*; where for above two hundred Years they are ſuppoſed to have *complied with the Cuſtoms*, and *conformed even to the Religion of the Country* [*a*]: As the Turn then and Genius of the *Ægyptians* diſpoſed them to affect *a Peculiarity in their Laws*, and *a difference of Manners* from *all* other Nations; ſo the *Jews* alſo, among whom we find *the ſame Diſpoſition and Affectation of Peculiarity*, may well be ſuppoſed to have derived this Humour from *Ægypt*. So that your Criticiſm is grounded meerly in your own Miſtake of the very Argument you pretend to criticiſe.

---

[a] Plut. Numa, p. 62. Edit. Pariſ.

[b] Reply, p. 22.

[c] Ibid. p. 27, 28.

[d] Reply, p. 23.

Secondly, I ſay on the Authority of *Herodotus*, *that the Ægyptians were more addicted to Prodigies and Miracles than any other People*: And here you tell me, that *I once more deceive my Reader*, *even at the expence of a falſe Quotation*, *ſince in the place referred to*, *Herodotus ſpeaks not a word of Miracles*, *but of Prodigies onely* [*b*]. As if a *Superſtitious Regard to Prodigies* did not imply an *equal Regard to Miracles*; and thoſe who are ſo fond of the one, were not of neceſſity as much addicted to the other; as it might eaſily be proved of the *Ægyptians* in particular by many other Authorities, if this before us was not ſufficient. But τέρατα the word uſed here, ſignifies, you ſay, *Prodigies*; and does it not ſignify *Miracles* too? If you think not, I would adviſe you to conſult your Dictionary, before you ſet up for a Critick: Nay, the very Reaſon you give why *Prodigies* muſt needs be meant in this Place, and not *Miracles*, proves juſt the contrary: For they were *ſuch things*, you ſay, *as could be found out*, *which Miracles could not be*: Now 'tis certain that *Miracles may be contrived*, *invented*, *or found out*, *as* τέρατα ἀνέυρηται, may properly be render'd; but the ſame cannot be ſaid of *monſtrous Births*, *unnatural Copulations*, &c. which you give as the Inſtances of *Prodigy*. And what, I pray, are the τερατούργοι mentioned by Authors; *the makers*

[*a*] Vid. Spencer de Legibus Heb. l. 1. c. 1.

[*b*] Reply, p. 24.

of monſtrous Births, or the Forgers of Miracles? The following Words indeed are applicable properly to *Prodigies*; but if the Sentence I have quoted be compleat in itſelf, as it ſeems to be conſidered in all our Editions, where 'tis diſtinguiſhed by a full point; then it leads more naturally to the Notion of *Miracles* than of *Prodigies:* However the ſame Word carries certainly in it the Notion of both, and a ſuperſtitious attention to the one, neceſſarily infers the ſame Regard to the other: So that your Obſervation has neither the uſe of Language nor Senſe to ſupport it.

Thirdly, I add, that the *Ægyptians had an High Prieſt, with an Hereditary Prieſthood deſcending from Father to Son.* To this you reply, *that 'tis unlucky for me that according to Herodotus they had not an High Prieſt over the whole Nation, as the Jews had, but one over each County or Province, of which there were thirty ſix; a Conſtitution ſo different from that of the Jews, that if I had repreſented it right, I could never lead my Reader to agree with me that Moſes borrowed it from Ægypt of all Countries under Heaven* [a]. Moſt acute and ingenious Reaſon! as if inſtead of a Similitude of Cuſtom, which is all I endeavour to ſhew, I had undertaken to prove an Identity or abſolute Uniformity in all Points and Circumſtances: Should a Foreign Prince take a fancy to copy the *Hierarchy* of *England*, and in proportion to the Extent of his Dominions, eſtabliſh either *one Archbiſhop* with ſubordinate *Biſhops*; or *one Biſhop* with ſubordinate *Prieſts*; which laſt Caſe was upon the Matter executed by the late *King of Pruſſia:* You without doubt would argue that the Hint could not poſſibly be taken from *England*; becauſe We had *two Archbiſhops* and He but *one*, or We *Archbiſhops* and *Biſhops*, and He onely *a Biſhop*. Your Reaſoning is full as ridiculous in the Caſe before us; as if *Moſes* could not take the Government of the *Diſtrict* or *Province* he lived in, as a Pattern for his own petty State, which was hardly much more conſiderable than a *ſingle County of Ægypt.*

But *'tis unlucky for me*, you ſay, *that Herodotus is not ſpeaking*

---

[a] Reply, p. 25.

here of any ſuch High Prieſt as the Jews had, one over the whole Nation, but one over each Province. Yet all the ill luck, I doubt, will be found at laſt on your ſide; who taking your Notions from ſeparate Paſſages of Authors, which you interpret preſently according to your own Prejudices, have happened in this Place, as in many others, to gueſs quite wrong. For tho' *Herodotus* tells us here [*a*], that there were *many Prieſts to each God,* and conſequently a great Number of them in the whole; yet he muſt be underſtood to mean, that there was *one High Prieſt* over thoſe many or the whole Number. This is very clear from other Paſſages of his Hiſtory, where he plainly intimates that there was but *one High Prieſt over the whole Nation*, juſt as there was but *one King:* That the *Number of their High Prieſts and their Kings, in a Succeſſion of* 341 *Generations, happened to be exactly equal:* That each *High Prieſt provided a Statue of himſelf to perpetuate his Memory to Poſterity:* And that he himſelf *was introduced by the Prieſts into a large Room or Temple, where theſe Statues were depoſited, and ſaw* 341 *of Coloſſean Size, the Images of ſo many High Prieſts in lineal Deſcent from Father to Son* [*b*]. Which cannot, I think, be applicable to any other *High Prieſt,* but juſt *ſuch an one as the Jews had, one over the whole Nation.*

Fourthly, *the Ægyptians,* I ſay, *abhorred Swine's Fleſh as impure and abominable.* And here indeed you own, that I deliver *the true Senſe of Herodotus*; to which I had added an Authority of *Joſephus* to the very ſame Purpoſe. As the Fact then is certain and agreed, that the *Ægyptians generally abhorred Swine's Fleſh, and abſtained from it ſuperſtitiouſly*; how can this be made an inſtance of *my falſifying or miſquoting Herodotus?* Why, *becauſe there are three Circumſtances,* as you obſerve with your uſual Acuteneſs, *in which the behaviour of the Jews and Ægyptians with regard to Swine were not alike* [*c*]. But if there had been *threeſcore* inſtead of *three,* it had been nothing at all to the purpoſe, ſince the Fact I contend for is allowed: All that I pretend to inti-

[*a*] Herod. l. 2. c. 37.

[*b*] Herod. l. 2. c. 143.

[*c*] Reply, p. 27.

mate, is, from the near Reſemblance of many Cuſtoms, that the *Jews* might probably have borrowed them from *Ægypt:* You cry out on the other hand, that the Inference is *unjuſt*, *partial*, *and contrived to deceive*, becauſe I do not ſhew in all points an *Identity of Cuſtom*. All which Clamour proves juſt nothing but your own want of Judgment, in not reflecting, that a Cuſtom may be borrowed, and yet altered, enlarged or reſtrained as the Borrower ſhall afterwards find convenient.

But there is one obſervation of yours, which I can't help taking notice of here; that ſince the Cuſtoms which the *Jews* had in common with the *Ægyptians*, were in uſe likewiſe in ſeveral other Countries; why, ſay you, *muſt they needs have been borrowed from Ægypt rather than from any other Country* [*a*]? This you repeat, and inſiſt on again in another place [*b*]; nay, you go ſo far in one Inſtance as to declare, *that of all Countries under Heaven Ægypt was the moſt unlikely to derive the Cuſtom from* [*c*]. Now I cannot for my life conceive, how 'tis poſſible for one, who knows any thing of the *Jewiſh Hiſtory*, and has the leaſt grain of Judgment, to put ſo ſilly a Queſtion. The *Jewiſh Nation* was nurſed up in *Ægypt* from its very infancy, and during a Reſidence there of above 200 Years grew up from one ſingle Family into a mighty People: In all which Time, as is abovementioned, they were trained in *all the Cuſtoms*, and complied even with the *Religion and Idolatry of the Country*: and even after they had quitted it, they retained ſtill, we find, the old fondneſs for the *Cuſtoms*, *Ceremonies* and *Worſhip* they had been uſed to: and this not onely on their Journey, when the Impreſſion and Memory of thoſe Cuſtoms were ſtrong on their Minds, but when they were ſettled in quiet Poſſeſſion of the promiſed Land, and formed into a regular State; where they continued remarkable for nothing ſo much as their Averſion to Strangers, and their Care to preſerve themſelves ſeparate and clear of any Mixture with all other Nations. If this be true, as it certainly is, what ground can there poſſibly be for what you ſo oft inculcate; *that*

[*a*] Reply, p. 25. [*b*] Ibid. p. 42, [*c*] Ibid. p. 25.

they might have borrowed their Cuſtoms from any other Country as probably as from Ægypt? Every Man of Senſe muſt needs laugh at you for entertaining the leaſt thought of its Probability; which you might however have entertained as long as you pleaſe, had you but excuſed me from thinking it probable too, and not made this very Inſtance, in which I follow *Reaſon*, *Fact* and *Hiſtory*, a Proof of my *Partiality and Prejudice againſt Moſes.*

Fifthly, I have paſſed over one of your Obſervations in my way, about the Treatment of *Leprous Perſons*, on purpoſe to give it a particular anſwer; as it is the onely one in your Book, where your Charge upon me of *miſquoting* is ſupported with any Truth or Reaſon. The Paſſage however is found in *Herodotus*, in the very Senſe I had given to it, tho' not, it ſeems, among the *Cuſtoms of Ægypt*, where I had ranged it, but of *Perſia* [a]. But tho' it would not perhaps be difficult to ſhew, that the ſame Treatment of *Leproſy* was practiſed alſo in *Ægypt*; yet, as the Quotation ſtands, I cannot but own it to be the effect of Negligence, and want of Attention in me: I took it from my Papers, whither I had tranſcribed it, and not having the Original near me, or being in haſte to finiſh what was before me, I truſted to Memory and the Perſuaſion I was under, that the Fact was related of *Ægypt*: Which I allow to be a Fault that deſerves Animadverſion, as I ſhould as frankly have done in any other Article you charge me with, had there appeared any juſt Ground or Reaſon for ſuch Charge. But ſince you have taken from me one *Ægyptian Cuſtom*, I think myſelf obliged to replace it with another, *viz.* the Laws *about Animals clean and unclean*; which the learned *Cotelerius* allows to have been taken probably *from the Practice of Ægypt*; *to which the Hebrew Nation*, he ſays, *were too much addicted* [b]; and gives us a Quotation of *Porphyry*, from *Chæremon the Ægyptian Hiſtorian*, importing, that the *Prieſts of Ægypt abſtained from Fiſh, and all four footed Beaſts, whoſe Hoofs either were not cloven*

---

[a] Reply, p. 26.

[b] Vid. Barnabæ Epiſt. ex Editione Cotelerii c. x. Not. 42. p. 30.

at all, or cloven into many Diviſions, or ſuch as had not Horns (or, what comes to the ſame, did not *chew the Cud)* and *all carnivorous Birds* [*a*].

It would be endleſs to run thro' all the *Jewiſh Cuſtoms,* which Men of the greateſt Learning and Experience in theſe ſtudies have deduced from the Practice of *Ægypt.* There's ſuch an *Affinity,* ſays *Kircher, between the Jewiſh and Ægyptian Rites, Sacrifices, Ceremonies; that either the Ægyptians muſt have Hebraiſed, or the Hebrews Ægyptiſed* [*b*]*:* But which of them followed the other in theſe Rites, is ſo clearly decided by the learned *Spencer,* that *no Man, unleſs ſupinely credulous,* as he ſays, can *believe it to have been the Ægyptians* [*c*]. And indeed both he and *Marſham* derive in a manner the *whole ritual Law* from this very Source of *Ægypt: The moveable Tabernable, Ark of the Covenant, Cherubims, Altar, Sacrifices, Prieſtly Veſtments, the Sabbath, Feſtivals, Waſhings, Purifications, Oracles, Prophecy, Divination,* &c [*d*].

You go on to obſerve, that I *ſhew my Skill or great Negligence of quoting, in falſly rendering into Engliſh the Latin Tranſlation of Maimonides's Words* [*e*]. Hard indeed, not to allow me capable of tranſlating even *Latin:* But whatever you pleaſe to allow, I pretend to a Skill which you are not yet Maſter of, of rendering the true Meaning of a Paſſage agreeable to the general Notion conveyed by it, without trifling and dwelling on the leſs ſignificant words, ſo as to hurt the main and obvious Senſe of the whole. Let us try your Criticiſm by this Rule. *Spencer* ſpeaking of *Circumciſion* in the Words of *Maimonides* [*f*], calls it *res duriſſima & difficillima;* here we have its Character and Deſcription; and the main Notion of the Paſſage is, that it was a *moſt harſh* and *moſt hazardous* thing: Now is it poſſible that a thing in its Nature the *moſt dangerous,* could ever be performed without *ſome Danger?* But *I change*, you ſay, *the reſtraining Word, ſometimes with Hazard, into ſome Hazard:* Where every body but yourſelf will ſee the propriety of it, in order to make the Sentence conſiſtent with itſelf: for as ſoon as I diſcover the true Sentiment of an Author, 'tis enough for me to catch hold of that, and not like your ſolemn Pedants think myſelf obliged to follow the very Inaccuracies and Perplexities of the Original.

[*a*] Ibid. p. 36. Not. 78.

[*b*] Propyl. Agoniſt. c. 2. apud Oedip. Ægypt. T. 1.

[*c*] Nemo vero niſi ſupinè credulus, opinari poteſt Ægyptios, &c. de Leg. Hebræor. l. 3. c. 2. Sec. 2. p. 650.

[*d*] Ibid. l. 3. c. 3. p. 663, &c.—It. Marſh. Can. Chron.

[*e*] Reply, p. 29.

[*f*] Res duriſſima & difficillima, nec ſine vitæ diſcrimine quandoque ſubeunda.

But you urge me ſtill and ſay, that *I ſhew my uſual Dexterity* in the uſe of a Paſſage taken from *Lightfoot* [a], on whoſe Authority I aſſert, that *the frequent Mortality occaſioned by Circumciſion produced a ſtanding Law, that when any Perſon had loſt three Children ſucceſſively by it, he was to be excuſed from circumciſing the reſt, in conſequence of which there were actually many uncircumciſed among them*, &c. Where *Lightfoot*, you obſerve, *ſpeaks not a word either of a ſtanding Law*, or *the frequent Mortality of Circumciſion.* But does not the Caſe itſelf ſpeak neceſſarily of both? And can any Man be ſo ſilly as to think, that by a *ſtanding Law* I could mean a *Law of Moſes?* No, the frequent Mortality occaſioned by Circumciſion produced a *Judgment* or *Deciſion*, as you own, of the *Rabbins* or *Jewiſh Doctors*, who were both Interpreters of the Law and Guides of Conſcience, that *when a Man had loſt three Children ſucceſſively by Circumciſion, he ſhould be excuſed from circumciſing the reſt.* This I call a *ſtanding Law* or *Practice*, or *Cuſtom*; grounded on a Decree of the proper Judges in the Caſe. But *Lightfoot*, you ſay, *does not ſpeak a Word of the frequent Mortality of it.* But does not the Fact he mentions as ſometimes happening *of three Children dying of it ſucceſſively*, neceſſarily imply and infer it? Allow the Caſe to have happened, tho' but ſeldom, and the other will follow of courſe: And here you ſhew, what you do indeed in every other Place, that your Cavils are founded onely in your own Miſtake of the very thing you cavil at: For you charge me as producing this Paſſage to prove, that the *Caſe of three Children's dying ſucceſſively by Circum-*

---

[a] Reply, p. 30.

ciſion was frequent with them [a]*:* Whereas all I endeavour to ſhew, is, that *the Mortality of Circumciſion muſt needs be frequent*, becauſe *that Caſe did ſometimes* happen: No body can imagine the Caſe itſelf to be very common, tho' you allow *five or ſix inſtances* of it on Record; and if no more had ever happened, they are more than ſufficient to ſhew, that Circumciſion was *ordinarily dangerous* and *often mortal:* You will hardly deny the *Small Pox* to be *frequently mortal*, yet few or none perhaps know five or ſix Caſes of *three Children dying ſucceſſively of it* in the ſame Family: which yet happened ſo often, according to *Lightfoot*, thro' *the danger of Circumciſion*, that there were *many uncircumciſed* on that account both of the *Prieſts and People.* And thus the Words of *Maimonides* and Paſſage of *Lightfoot*, in ſpite of your Cavils, demonſtrably prove all I contend for, *the frequent Mortality of Circumciſion.*

I have now gone thro' your *Criticiſms on my Quotations*, and have ſhewn them to be both falſe and trifling, void both of Learning and Judgment: But this, Sir, ought not to reflect ſo much Shame on you, as the want of Candour and Truth, and the love of Calumny you betray in the Management of them. At ſetting out you would perſuade your Reader, that there's *ſcarce one Quotation*, which I have not abuſed and miſrepreſented; yet out of *fourſcore* you attempt onely ſome ſlight Objections to *fifteen*, as you reckon, but as every body elſe will count, *thirteen* onely; the two laſt, as we ſhall preſently ſee, being not exceptions to my *Quotations*, (as to enhance the Number, you abſurdly call them) but to my Reaſonings: And of theſe *thirteen*, there's but a *poor ſingle one* left you, in which you have ſhewn indeed ſome want of attention or too much haſte in me, but no poſſible ſuſpicion of any wilful Miſrepreſentation. Is this then the part of a Man of Honour or Integrity to calumniate ſo ſtrongly on a Foundation ſo weak? Is this ſuitable to the Gravity of the Perſon you aſſume, and your conjuring me ſo ſolemnly *in God's Name, and for the*

---

[a] Reply, p. 31.

ſake of Sincerity, to weigh things better, and report Facts more fairly [a]? Will not the Reader be apt to entertain the ſame Suſpicion of your Religion, as he muſt before have done of your Learning, that with all this Outcry about it, you have no real Eſteem or Concern for it; for which Reflection he will find ſtill but too much Reaſon in what follows?

You proceed to call over again the *Story of Babel*, and declare my account of *that Confuſion* to be *truly a confuſed one* [b]: where for the ſake of a ſtupid Jeſt, you put your Judgment to ſome riſk with the Reader; who may not perhaps be of Opinion, that my way of writing is ſo *confuſed* as you would intimate: But to come to the Point. I ſhall firſt conſider what you object to my Account of this Fact, and then examin the Merit of your own Expoſition of it.

I have ſaid in *my Letter, that the Sons of Noah were ſo far from any Reſolution of not diſperſing themſelves, that before the Confuſion of Babel they had already begun to diſperſe, and actually ſent off a great Colony from the Eaſt to the Land of Shinaar* [c]. For this I produced the concurrent Teſtimony both of *Proteſtant* and *Papiſt*, both *Patrick* and *Calmet*; and thought myſelf very orthodox and ſafe under the Shelter of ſuch Authority; but all, it ſeems, in vain; ſince *the Queſtion*, you ſay [d], *is not what any Commentator has fancied, but what the Scripture has taught about the Matter.* How hard is it to deal with ſuch thorough-paced Divines? *Commentators* are at ſome times every thing; at others nothing with them. Doctor *Waterland* contemns his Adverſary for having *no Acquaintance* with them [e]; and you contemn me for being *acquainted* with them: The Doctor ſays, *that there's not one Commentator of Note but would have ſet his Antagoniſt right* [f]; you pretend to ſhew, that *Two of the beſt Note* have ſet me *quite wrong* [g]. But there cannot be much difficulty in defending *Patrick* and *Calmet* againſt ſuch an Expoſitor as your ſelf: Let's try what can be done.

---

[a] Reply, p. 40, 41.

[b] Reply, p. 31.

[c] Letter to Dr. Waterland, p. 41.

[d] Reply, p. 32.

[e] Script. Vind. Par. 1. p. 8.

[f] Ibid. p. 24.

[g] Rep. p. 32.

You obſerve, that in the end of the *tenth Chapter of Geneſis* preceding the *Story of Babel*, 'tis ſaid of the *Sons of Noah*, *that by them were the Nations divided in the Earth after the Flood.* And then it follows, Chap. xi. *And the whole Earth was of one Language and one Speech. Where all Mankind*, you ſay, *is ſpoken of without the Excluſion of any Part.* But, pray Sir, what do theſe two Verſes import, but that the ſeveral Nations of the World were founded and peopled by the *Diſperſion of the Sons of Noah*, and that before *the Confuſion of Babel* the whole Earth had but *one Language?* Where the very Expreſſion of the *whole Earth* ſeems to intimate ſome kind of diſperſion and peopling of different Countries previous to *that Confuſion.* But in the next Verſe 'tis ſaid, *And it came to paſs as they journeyed from the Eaſt, that they found a Plain in the Land of Shinaar and dwelt there.* That is; of theſe *Sons of Noah*, by whom the *Nations were divided,* in the very Act of dividing and diſperſing themſelves, as one *great Part or Colony* travelled from the *Eaſt*, they found a convenient Plain and ſettled there. But here's not a *Word*, you ſay, *about their diſperſing themſelves, or ſending of Colonies:* But is it not implied in this *journeying from the Eaſt;* or is it poſſible to diſperſe any otherwiſe than by journeying from one Place to another? But there's no Hint given; you obſerve, that this is to be underſtood of a *part of them* onely, and not of the *whole.* But where the Text is ſilent, or obſcure, muſt not we fill up the Senſe of it from Reaſon and the Nature of things, which neceſſarily ſuggeſt ſuch a Diſtinction? For what Senſe can there be in ſuppoſing, as you do, that the whole of Mankind muſt needs travel thus from Place to Place in one Body? Why, *when they had conſumed the Proviſion and Forage their firſt Settlement afforded, they were forced*, you ſay, *to remove to another.* But would not Reaſon and Neceſſity have taught them, that the onely Remedy for this Evil muſt be their *ſeparating* from each other, and not *journeying together?* For the ſame Inconvenience would always attend them, whilſt they all held in a Body; and there could have been no end of their journeying, if they had hung together, till they had eat up every thing the Place afforded: All which Diſtreſs would have been prevented at once, if as ſoon as Victuals grew ſcarce for their *whole Number*, they had ſent off a *Part* or *Colony* to freſh Quarters; whilſt as many of them ſtaid behind and kept Poſſeſſion of the old ones, as they were capable of receiving.

Again, by ſuppoſing the *whole Body of Mankind* to be concerned and preſent at the *Confuſion of Babel*, you involve *Noah and his Sons*, who were then alive, in the Guilt and Partnerſhip of that Rebellion againſt God: But 'tis improbable or incredible rather, that ſuch a *Preacher of Righteouſneſs*, whoſe Faith and Virtues are ſo celebrated in Scripture, could either have conſented himſelf to ſo wicked a Project, or that ſo *venerable a Parent of human Race* ſhould not have Credit and Authority enough in his own Family to have reſtrained them from ſo daring an Impiety. So that 'tis on all accounts highly reaſonable to conclude with the *learned Commentators* above mentioned, that it was but *a Colony or Part of the whole*, that travelled from the *Eaſt*, and were concerned in building the *Tower of Babel.*

But I had obſerved in my Letter, that *all we can collect from this Story is, that the Multitude at Babel, knowing they muſt ſoon be diſperſed ſtill further, had a mind before ſuch Diſperſion to erect ſome publick Monument of their common Origin, by building a City and a Tower that ſhould reach as high as Heaven; and that it was the Preſumption and Arrogance of this Deſign that induced God to baffle it by confounding their Language*, &c. Now you on the contrary affirm, that *I collect from the Story a Deſign quite different from what the Story expreſly mentions* [a]: Where I muſt leave it to the Reader to judge whether I have juſtly repreſented the Senſe of Scripture or no: For does it not plainly intimate, that the Ground of their offending God, was in the

---

[a] Reply, p. 35.

Deſign they had projected of *building a Tower as high as Heaven?* Does it give any other Inſtance of their Arrogance and Preſumption? And does it not likewiſe expreſly ſay, that their Intent was to *raiſe themſelves a Name* by the Project they had formed? The Story I declared to be a *ſtrange one*, and durſt not for that Reaſon venture on any other Solution of it, than what the very Words ſuggeſted. But *I was miſled*, you ſay, *and endeavour to miſlead my Reader by the idle Tranſlation of the Old Greek and Latin Interpreters*; ſince the Original imports juſt what our *Engliſh Verſion* gives; *let us build a City and a Tower that may reach to Heaven, and let us make a Name, leſt we be ſcattered abroad*, &c. And allowing all this; does not even the Word *leſt* imply an Apprehenſion or Notion that they ſhould ſhortly be obliged to diſperſe further; and an Intention conſequently to erect this *publick Monument and make themſelves a Name before ſuch Diſperſion?* But the Word *leſt* according to you gives a quite different Turn to the Senſe; as if it had been ſaid, *let us build a City and a Tower, to prevent or hinder our further Diſperſion.* Strange Nonſenſe! As if a Tower could change the Nature of Things, and prevent their being ſcattered abroad or diſperſed to people the Earth: Unleſs you can ſuppoſe them reſolved to combat Heaven itſelf, and ſilly enough to imagine that by the help of ſuch Entrenchments they ſhould be able to baffle the Power of the Almighty.

The Text then, whether we render it according to the *Seventy Interpreters* and the old *Latin*, or according to our *vulgar Engliſh*, comes, we ſee, in a manner to the ſame thing: I cannot however diſmiſs it without obſerving the Raſhneſs of your Cenſure on the *Old Greek Verſion*, which you call an *Idle Tranſlation*, tho' it was ſo frequently uſed, and *authenticated* as it were by our *Saviour*, *the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts*, and held for Sacred and Inſpired by all the *Primitive Fathers*.

I ſhall now juſt ſpend a Word or two in examining your own Account of *this Hiſtorical Fact*; where tho' you ſeem cautious of uſing Dr. *Waterland*'s Words, yet you aſſert in effect the very ſame thing, which in every Dreſs of Language will always be equally abſurd. The *Doctor* ſays, *that the Sons of Noah had formed a Conſpiracy to hang together in a Cluſter, and neither to diſperſe nor cultivate the Ground, had not God miraculouſly interpoſed to confound their Projects*, &c [*a*]. You ſay, *that they were reſolved to hold cloſely together*; *to adhere ſtrictly to each other, and never to part, if God had not forced them to it, to prevent thoſe Quarrels and Wars which would inevitably ariſe among them from their living together*, &c [*b*]. Strange, that ſuch a loving, fond Society, that could not bear the thought of leaving each other, *determined*, as you ſay, *to live and die together* [*c*], ſhould ſo ſoon be engaged in *Quarrels and Wars!* But their Love, it ſeems, was ſo extravagant, that it was worſe than Death to them to part, and they would chuſe rather to kill one another, than live aſunder. 'Tis ſurprizing, I ſay, that Men of any Underſtanding can take up with ſuch Abſurdities, and after much Pains and Plodding ſhould have got no further in thinking than what their Nurſes had taught them.

Had Mankind in thoſe firſt Ages of the World been all confin'd within ſome *Iſland*, whence no Eſcape was practicable; the Account you give might have had ſome Reaſon in it, that as faſt as their Numbers increaſed and their Victuals diminiſhed, they muſt have been forced to deſtroy and prey upon each other; but even in ſuch a Caſe, rather than periſh by Hunger, they would have ſtruggled hard and tried many an Invention of Floats and Veſſels in queſt of better Quarters by Sea: But to ſuppoſe ſuch a Multitude in the middle of the Continent and in fruitful Plains determined to hold together till they ſtarved, and like Men in the Extremity of a Siege, killing each other for want of Victuals, which yet might be had for fetching; whilſt Plenty and all the World lay before them, if they would but diſperſe themſelves to the Enjoyment of it; is ſo ſenſeleſs and abſurd a Notion, that 'tis inconceivable how any Man can entertain it. There could not then be any want of a Miracle to bring about the *Diſperſion of Mankind* in its infant, growing State; or occaſion for any other Command, than what was given to Man at his Creation and implanted in his Nature; *encreaſe and multiply*; the certain Conſequence of which is to *diſperſe and repleniſh the Earth*: His own natural Appetites would neceſſarily force him to it, as ſoon as it became convenient, in ſpite of any Will or Reſolution to the contrary, could any ſuch without Abſurdity be ſuppoſed.

[*a*] Scripture Vindicated, Part 1. p. 42.

[*b*] Reply, p. 38, 39, &c.

[*c*] Ib. p. 39.

You come at laſt to expoſe the *Falſhood of the Hiſtorical Facts*, which *I have raſhly advanced*, as you ſay [a], *in ſeveral Parts of my Letter*: Where one would imagine that you would have conteſted with me every *ſingle Fact* I had touched upon, ſince you proclaim it in your *Title Page*, and undertake to ſhew the *general Falſhood* of them all: Yet all the *Facts* you pretend to diſpute with me are but *two*; and of theſe *two*, the ſecond, as I've obſerved above, is *no Queſtion of Fact* at all, but a Squabble onely about my Opinion or Manner of ſolving a *certain Fact* which we both allow to be delivered in Hiſtory, viz. the *Confuſion of Babel*. This you call *one of the Hiſtorical Facts*, *that I have falſly advanced*; which ſhews the little Arts you are forced to uſe to raiſe an Outcry againſt me, and enhance the Sum total of my Malice and Impiety.

The *onely Fact* then you conteſt with me, as *raſhly advanced in my Letter*, is concerning the *Learning*, *Politeneſs and flouriſhing Condition of Ægypt in Moſes's Time*. I had aſſerted it to be more probable that the *Jews* ſhould borrow from the *Ægyptians*, than the *Ægyptians* from the *Jews*, from the general Character of the two Nations: of the *Ægyptians*, as always *learned and polite*; of the *Jews*, always *rude and illiterate*. And tho' I had aſſigned no Period of Time to their Fame for Learning, yet ſince my Reaſoning ſuppoſes them poſſeſſed of it before *Moſes*'s time, I will here join Iſſue, and allow, as you ſay [b], that *the Queſtion*

---

[a] Reply, p. 41.

[b] Reply, p. 42.

between us is, whether Ægypt was ſo great a Kingdom, ſo polite a Nation in Moſes's time as I have repreſented it. This then is the Fact, that I undertake to make good; I will not ſay againſt you, who ſeem to know but little of the Matter, but againſt what you abſurdly call the *Demonſtrations and Diſcoveries of Sir Iſaac Newton* [a].

You had heard much talk of Sir *Iſaac's Demonſtrations* in Mathematicks and his great *Diſcoveries* in Natural Knowledge; and imagined perhaps that thoſe Words ſignified nothing more than *Conjecture* or *Opinion.* For had you reflected what a *Demonſtration* meant, you could not have applied it to a *Syſtem of Chronology*, however probable, or preferable to all others, which from the Nature of Things can never reach Certainty or admit of *Demonſtration.* But, pray Sir, after all what is it that Sir *Iſaac* has diſcovered? has he brought to light any old Authors, which for Ages paſt had lain buried in Oblivion; or any Monuments of Antiquity unknown before to the Curious? Or has he done in the learned, what he did in the natural World; invented a *new Teleſcope*, to pry into remote and dark Antiquity with more Accuracy than had been practicable before? If he has done nothing of this, then *all his Diſcoveries* can amount onely to *Conjecture*; which, like that of all other Men, will always be fallible and uncertain, as we ſhall find more eſpecially in the very Inſtance before us.

In ſaying this, I am far from any thought of weakening the Authority or leſſening the Character of Sir *Iſaac*; I have as great an Honour for him as you have, and look upon him as one of the greateſt Philoſophers the World has ever produced: But if as in Mathematicks and Philoſophy, ſo in every other Part of Learning, his Authority muſt needs be advanced above that of all others; I muſt take the liberty to diſſent from you, and to declare, that for a thorough Knowledge of Antiquity, and the whole Compaſs of *Greek and Ægyptian* Learning, there have been, in my Opinion, and now are, many Men as far ſuperior to him, as he within his proper Character is ſuperior to every body elſe. And I cannot but obſerve, that it is much the ſame Caſe here with the *Authority of Sir Iſaac*, as it was above with that of *Moſes*; 'tis not I, but you who weaken it, by forcing and ſtretching it to a Point whither it can't be extended, to a length it never can reach.

---

[a] Reply, p. 44, 50.

But to come to the Queſtion, of the *Politeneſs and Learning of the Ægyptians in Moſes's time:* I had touched it but ſlightly in my *Letter*, imagining that it muſt have been taken for granted, or could not at leaſt be called in queſtion by any *Chriſtian* on the ſingle Teſtimony of St. *Stephen*; who affirms, *Moſes to have been learned in all the Wiſdom of the Ægyptians* [*a*]. But I was much ſurprized to find you treat St. *Stephen*'s Authority ſo ſlightly; by telling us, *that theſe Words of St. Stephen were not a Proof of any thing but that he ſpake according to the then receiv'd Tradition of the Jews* [*b*]; which is telling us in effect, that they proved juſt nothing at all, but that himſelf was miſled by the vulgar Errors and popular Prejudices of that Age; that had he lived to ſee Sir *Iſaac Newton*'s *Demonſtrations and Diſcoveries,* he muſt have been of another Mind. Strange! to find ſo zealous an Advocate of Chriſtianity, in order to get rid of a ſlight Difficulty, deſtroying the very Foundation of all Revealed Religion. For is it poſſible, Sir, that a Perſon *inſpired by God, full of the Holy Ghoſt,* and ſpeaking under the *actual Influence and Direction of the Divine Spirit*, as St. *Stephen* here did, could be miſled by popular Error or Prejudice to utter any thing falſe and erroneous? Such a Conceſſion muſt needs ſhake, I ſay, the very Foundation of *Chriſtianity* itſelf. For what impreſſion could its Dictates make, if tho' inſpired, they could yet be ſuppoſed to be falſe? Thus whilſt your zeal for ſenſeleſs Syſtems tranſports you to treat me rudely, for moderating onely the extravagant Notions of ſome of our popular Divines, and demoliſhing ſuch ſlight Outworks as make the Defence of Religion more difficult; you betray the very Citadel, and yield up the Fortreſs itſelf. This is a length and freedom of thinking which, I aſſure you, I cannot reach; however you are pleaſed to calumniate me as a *Favourer of Infidelity:* For tho' I'm far from thinking every Title in the *Holy Scriptures to be inſpired*; or that Perſons *inſpired* on certain Occaſions, muſt of courſe be *infallible* on all; yet I cannot but think it a Point fundamental and neceſſary to be believed by all Chriſtians, that whilſt a Man is under the *actual Influence and Direction of the Holy Ghoſt*, he muſt at the ſame time be *infallible and ſuperior to all Error*; or elſe Chriſtianity cannot be defended. In the preſent Caſe therefore from the ſingle Teſtimony of St. *Stephen*, *full of the Holy Ghoſt*, we are as much obliged to believe, *that Learning flouriſhed in Ægypt before Moſes's time*, as that Chriſtianity itſelf is true; for both muſt ſtand or fall together.

[*a*] Act. vii. 22.

[*b*] Reply, p. 49.

And here I have the pleaſure to find my Opinion confirmed by Dr. *Waterland* himſelf, on whoſe Learning and Judgment you ſet ſo high a Value; who affirms the *Authority of St. Stephen ſpeaking by the Spirit of God*, with regard to any Action or Paſſage of Hiſtory, to be ſufficient to ſilence all Cavils to the thing itſelf, tho' otherwiſe ſeemingly wrong and contrary to the reaſon of things; as in the Caſe of *Moſes's killing the Ægyptian:* how much more deciſive then muſt the ſame Authority be, when it aſſerts onely a plain matter of Fact, in itſelf harmleſs and indifferent? Why, to uſe the *Doctor*'s own Words; the *Queſtion admits of a ſhort Deciſion, and is onely this? Whether St. Stephen full of the Holy Ghoſt, or a Gentleman full of himſelf and his own imaginations be moſt likely to paſs a true Judgment on the Caſe* [a]?

To the Teſtimony of St. *Stephen* we may add another from the *Old Teſtament*; where in celebrating the great Wiſdom of *Solomon* 'tis ſaid, that it *exceeded that of the Ægyptians* [b]. Now this, whether we are to take it for *inſpired*, or as a mere *hiſtorical Teſtimony*, muſt however convince all who have any regard for Scripture, that *Ægypt was famed for Wiſdom before the Age of Solomon*; but Scripture is nothing with you to Sir *Iſaac's Demonſtrations*; *who has diſ-*

---

[a] Script. Vindic. Part 2. p. 5.

[b] 1 Kings iv. 30.

covered, it ſeems, that the *Ægyptians had not ſo much as the uſe of Letters* among them till *Solomon's Reign* [a].

With this Account of *Scripture* the whole Stream of *Profane Hiſtory* entirely agrees; that the *Ægyptians* of all People in the World had the moſt antient Monuments, and moſt authentick Proofs of their *Learning and Antiquity.*

Herodotus owns, that the *Greeks* borrowed almoſt every thing from them; that they were the Inventors of moſt Arts and Sciences; *the Diviſion of the Year*; *the Immortality of the Soul*; *the Names and Worſhip of the Gods, Altars, Statuary, Sculpture,* &c [b]. That they reckoned a Succeſſion of Kings from *Hercules to Amaſis, for the Space of ſeventeen thouſand Years*; *which they pretended to demonſtrate by an exact Regiſter and Computation of Time regularly preſerved in their ſacred Books* [c].

Diodorus Siculus gives much the ſame Account of their *Antiquity* and *Invention of Arts and Sciences*; and ſays, that *beſides their fabulous Hiſtory, wherein they ſuppoſed their Country to have been governed by the Gods, they pretended to a Succeſſion of four hundred and ſeventy Kings and five Queens Natives of Ægypt, excluſive of the Time they were under the Æthiopians, Perſians and Macedonians*; *of all which Reigns they had clear and diſtinct Accounts in their ſacred Records, deſcribing particularly every Prince's Perſon, Character and Length of Reign*; *from which Books he himſelf had made his Extracts* [d]. He ſays alſo, what indeed all other Writers confirm, that it was *antiently the moſt populous of all the known Countries of the World*; *and had in it above eighteen thouſand Cities and conſiderable Towns. Pomponius Mela* and *Pliny* affirm it to have had *twenty thouſand in the Reign of Amaſis,* and that it continued to their own Time, *well ſtocked with Cities, tho' leſs noble ones* [e].

---

[a] Reply, p. 43.

[b] Herod. l. 2. c. 4, 46, 50, 123, &c.

[c] Ibid. c. 43. Ταῦτα Ἀιγύπτιοι ἀτρεκέως φασὶ ἐπίστασθαι ἀιεὶ τὸ λογιζόμενοι καὶ ἀιεὶ ἀπογραφόμενοι τὰ ἔτεα. Ibid. c. 145.

[d] Biblioth. Hiſt. l. 1. p. 41, 42. Edit. Rhodom. It. p. 27. B.

[e] De Situ Orbis, l. 1. c. 9. Hiſt. Nat. l. 5. c. 9.

This Notion of the *Greatneſs*, *Antiquity and Learning of the Ægyptians ſuperior to all other Nations*, is fully confirm'd and aſſerted by all the *primitive Writers* both *Jews* and *Chriſtians*.

Philo the learned *Jew*, who himſelf lived in *Ægypt*, tells us, that *Moſes learnt of his Ægyptian Maſters, who were ſought out for him from all Parts, Arithmetick, Geometry, Muſick, and their Philoſophy expreſſed by Symbols, or Hieroglyphicks under the Figures of Animals; and Mathematicks, which the Ægyptians were eſpecially fond of*, &c [a].

Clemens of Alexandria, who lived likewiſe in *Ægypt*, exactly follows *Philo*'s Account, and aſcribes to the *Ægyptians* the Invention of the principal Arts and Sciences [b].

Euſebius after both affirms the ſame thing; aſcribes to the *Ægyptians the Invention of Arts and Sciences*, declares, that they had the *cleareſt and moſt undoubted Monuments of their Antiquity*, and that *the Greeks borrowed all in a manner from them* [c].

Joſephus is juſt in the ſame Story with the reſt, and allows them in *Solomon*'s time to have *excelled all other Nations in the Fame of their Wiſdom* [d].

Now if there had been any Prejudice in theſe *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtan* Writers, who were all zealous and orthodox in their Religion, it muſt needs have been like yours on the other ſide of the Queſtion; in thinking it a *Diminution to the Authority of Moſes*, to imagine that he had borrowed any thing from *Ægypt*; but the Notoriety of the Fact and the Teſtimony of all Hiſtory obliged them to allow and aſſert the Truth, which can never do Hurt to any Cauſe that is good.

But 'tis time to examine what Sir *Iſaac Newton has demonſtrated and diſcovered* in Oppoſition to all this Authority. Why, he has obſerved, that *Ægypt was ſo thinly peopled before the Birth of Moſes, that Pharaoh ſaid of the Iſraelites, behold the Children of Iſrael are*

---

[a] De Vita Moſis lib. 1. p. 605, 606.

[b] Strom. l. 1. p. 413, 361. Edit. Potter.

[c] Præparat. Evangel. p. 29, &c. It. 279, 280. &c. Edit. R. Steph.

[d] Con. Ap. 1. 2. 6. Et Antiq. Jud. l. 8. c. 2, §. 5.

more and mightier than we: From whence it may at leaſt, you ſay, *be inferred, that the Jews were then no leſs powerful and flouriſhing a People than the Ægyptians* [a]. Where you ſeem to think yourſelf very modeſt in not inſiſting on much more, viz. that the *Iſraelites were even more potent and numerous than their Maſters the Ægyptians.* Strange Notion indeed! Not that I wonder at you, whoſe Notions ſeem generally to be taken on truſt, but at Sir *Iſaac* for entertaining it; being grounded meerly on Miſtake or want of Attention to the *lofty and hyperbolical Stile of Scripture:* For by the ſame Reaſon he might as well have proved, that the *Jews* were abſolutely the moſt powerful Nation in the World, ſince none of the *great Monarchies* ever reached the height of thoſe Deſcriptions we find given of them in the *Sacred Writings*; where they are oft deſcribed to be as numerous *as the Sands of the Sea and the Stars of Heaven* [b], *for Multitude.* And it is from the ſame Sublimity of Expreſſion, that the *ſeven petty Nations* of the promiſed Land are ſaid to *be more and mightier* than theſe very *Iſraelites*; and their *Cities impregnable and even fenced up to Heaven* [c]. But to review the Text itſelf, whence you draw this Inference: *The People of Iſrael,* ſays *Pharaoh, are more and mightier than we:* And what's the Conſequence? Why, a Reſolution *to afflict them the more heavily for it,* and to make their Slavery the more *rigorous* [d]. A wonderful Proof of *ſuperior Power and Might,* to ſuffer themſelves to be treated the worſe for it by the *fewer and weaker!*

But to examine a little the Poſſibility of this Notion from the very Account we have of it in *Scripture.* Whilſt *Abraham* the *Father of the Jews* was yet childleſs, *Ægypt* is repreſented as a formed and eſtabliſhed Monarchy: For we read of *Pharaoh its King,* with *his Princes* or great Courtiers around him [e]. About two hundred Years after, at *Jacob*'s Deſcent into *Ægypt,* when the whole Poſterity of *Abraham* reached onely the Number of *ſeventy*

---

[a] Reply, p. 42, 43.

[b] Gen. xxii. 17. 2 Sam. xvii. 11. Heb. xi. 12.

[c] Deut. vii. 1. Exod. ix. 1.

[d] Exod. i. 9, &c.

[e] Gen. xii. 15.

venty Perſons, we have a more particular Deſcription of the Wealth and flouriſhing Condition of that Kingdom [*a*]. And yet in about two hundred Years more, you ſuppoſe the *ſmall Family of Jacob* to be grown ſuperior in Power and Numbers to a Kingdom founded ſo many Ages before; which all this while had held them in Bondage and Slavery, and employed them in conſtant Drudgery and hard Labour.

Again, conſider the Circumſtances of their Flight from *Ægypt. Pharaoh* repenting of the Leave he had given them, purſues them with *ſix hundred choſen Chariots* [*b*]; and, as *Joſephus* adds, *with fifty thouſand Horſe, and two hundred thouſand Foot* [*c*]. Which yet could onely be a ſmall Part of the military Force of *Ægypt*; as it muſt have been gathered in haſte and marched on ſo ſhort a warning. With this Force, according to the ſame *Hiſtorian,* he hemmed them in in ſuch a manner between the Mountains and the Water, that they muſt all have been infallibly cut off, had not a Paſſage been opened to them of a ſudden, either miraculouſly or accidentally thro' the Red Sea. So that taking the Account from *Scripture* and the *Jews themſelves,* there cannot be any ground for a Compariſon of the *Power and flouriſhing Condition* of the two Nations.

This, Sir, is what Sir *Iſaac's Diſcoveries* amount to with regard to the *Strength and Greatneſs of the Ægyptian Nation:* Let us next ſee what he has *demonſtrated* againſt the Learning and Wiſdom, which I ſuppoſe them to have had in *Moſes's time.* Why he ſays, that the *Invention of Letters was aſcribed by the Ægyptians to Thoth, Secretary to King Oſiris; who was the ſame Perſon as Bacchus, as Seſoſtris, as Seſac or Shiſac who plundered the Temple of Jeruſalem in the time of Rehoboam* [*d*]: And conſequently that they were ſo far from having any Learning, that they had not even the *uſe of Letters* till about *Solomon*'s Reign. But how does he prove all this? why, by meer Conjecture: *Oſiris, Bacchus, Seſoſtris,* ſays he, *lived about the ſame time; were all Kings of Ægypt; potent by Land and Sea; all great Conquerors; carried their Conqueſts as far as India; all left Pillars with Inſcriptions, &c. and therefore all three muſt be the ſame King, and this King can be no other than Seſac* [a]. And he might as well have ſaid, that they muſt all be the ſame with *Alexander the Great,* ſince much the ſame Actions are attributed alſo to him.

[*a*] Gen. xlvi, &c.

[*b*] Exod. xiv. 7.

[*c*] Antiq. Jud. l. 2. c. 15. §. 3, &c.

[*d*] Reply, p. 43. Newt. Chron. p. 210.

I ſhall not trouble myſelf with examining this Conjecture any further, than as it concerns the *Fact* I am engaged to ſupport, that the *Ægyptians had Arts and Learning amongſt them before the time of Seſac or Rehoboam.* And how is it poſſible to imagine that ſo *great a Kingdom as Ægypt,* which, as we learn from Scripture, had flouriſhed for about a thouſand Years from the time of *Abraham* to *Shiſac,* ſhould thro' all that Period want not onely the *uſe of Letters,* but almoſt all the other Arts and Inventions uſeful to Life; whilſt the *petty State of the Jews* bordering ſo cloſely upon them, had all this while the familiar uſe of them all? *Oſiris* according to the Ancients, and his Wife *Iſis,* invented the *Culture of the Vine; Phyſick; Sowing and Ploughing,* &c [b]. Now, if Sir *Iſaac*'s Conjecture be true, they muſt have lived without *Medicine,* *Corn* or *Wine* till the time of *Shiſac* or *Solomon,* whilſt yet we know certainly from *Scripture* that they had *Phyſicians and Plenty of Corn,* near ſeven hundred Years before in *Joſeph*'s time [c].

In the *Book of Job,* which is ſuppoſed by many to be older than *Moſes* himſelf, the *uſe of Letters and Writing* is repreſented as a thing of long and antient ſtanding [d]. And the *Iſraelites* themſelves at their coming out of *Ægypt,* were not onely acquainted with *Letters,* but all the *common Arts* and *Sciences* uſeful to Life; which are not yet ſpoken of as new or lately invented, but referred to as things vulgar and of old familiar to them. *Moſes,* we know,

---

[a] Newt. ibid. p. 193.

[b] Diod. Sic. l. 1. p. 14. It. p. 22. It. Euſeb. Præp. Ev. p. 29, &c.

[c] Gen. l. 2. It. xlii. 1.

[d] Job xix. 23. viii. 8.

wrote down the Words of the Lord [a]; and *Joſhua wrote the Covenant he made with the People in the Book of the Law* [b]*:* But they had written to little purpoſe, had not *writing* been known before, and in common uſe with the People; who were in Poſſeſſion likewiſe of all the *other Arts*, as *Building*, *Statuary*, *Sculpture*, *cutting and ſetting of precious Stones*, *working in all ſorts of Metals*, *Embroidery*, *Needlework* [c]. Now, where can we imagine them to have learnt theſe Arts? In fighting their way thro' an Enemy's Country; or in the Wilderneſs? That's impoſſible: Or was *Moſes* the Inventor of them? That's as impoſſible as the other [d]: For in the Hurry and unſettled State they were in, they had neither Ability nor Leiſure to invent or learn any thing: Nor is it credible that the Scripture, which ſo carefully relates every other great Action of *Moſes*, could have been ſilent on ſuch an occaſion, and omitted to give him the Glory of Inventions ſo uſeful and neceſſary to the Life of Man. So that 'tis as evident and certain, as both Reaſon and Hiſtory can make it, that *Moſes* and the *Children of Iſrael* came furniſhed and provided out of *Ægypt* not onely with *Letters* and the uſe of *Writing*, but all the other *Arts and Sciences.*

Beſides, it was conſtantly objected to the *Jews* by their Enemies; that they *were of all Barbarians the moſt rude and illiterate, and the onely People in the World who had never contributed any ſhare to the common Benefit of Mankind, by the Invention of any thing new or uſeful* to Life [e]: This was their Character in the World: And *Joſephus* is ſo far from confuting it, that he owns the Charge; and excuſes it from the Nature and Policy of their Government, which obliged them to ſuch an *immutable* and *inviolable obſervance of their Laws*, that they were reſtrained and crampt from attempting and ſtriking out any thing new [a]. But if *Joſephus* had dreamt of what Sir *Iſaac*, you ſay, *has now diſcovered*, how readily could he have anſwered, that the Charge was ſo far from being true, that he could demonſtrate the Jews to be the very *Authors and Inventors*, not onely of *Letters and Writing*, but of all other *Arts and Sciences* in the World; and to have had the actual Uſe and Poſſeſſion of them for at leaſt five hundred Years before they were known in *Ægypt:* Which tho' contrary to *Scripture* and the Teſtimony of all *Hiſtory*, is yet the neceſſary Conſequence of what you call Sir *Iſaac's Demonſtrations.*

---

[a] Exod. xxiv. 4.

[b] Joſh. xxiv. 26.

[c] Exod. xxxvi. &c.

[d] Moſem multi frivolis rationibus ducti ſcribendi auctorem faciunt. Kirch. Ob. Pam. l. 1. 2.

[e] Ἀφυεστάτους ἔιναι τῶν βαρβάρων; καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μηδὲν ἐς τὸν βίον εὕρημα συμβεβλῆσθαι μόνους. Joſ. con. Ap. l. 2. c. 14.

Thus, inſtead of expoſing the *Falſhood of my Hiſtorical Facts*, as you had undertaken in your *Title Page*, you have expoſed nothing at laſt but your own Ignorance both of *Sacred and Profane Antiquity*; for to thoſe who have any Acquaintance with either, 'tis impoſſible to place the *Origin of Letters and Arts in Ægypt*, ſo low as *Solomon's time.*

But you inſult me ſtill further with Sir *Iſaac's Diſcoveries*, and charge me with two Miſtakes more, made in open Defiance of them: Firſt, for affirming the *Golden Calf made by Aaron to be nothing elſe but the Ægyptian God Apis.* Whereas Sir *Iſaac*, you ſay, *has* proved, that *Apis was no other Perſon than Seſoſtris or Shiſac, who reigned in the Days of Solomon* [b]. 'Tis ſtrange, that I muſt not be thought *Orthodox* here, where I have the Concurrence of all the beſt Writers both *Ancient and Modern* to ſupport my Opinion [c]. *Philo* tells us, *that they turned the Abſence of Moſes to an Occaſion of Impiety, and forgetful of the true God, ſet themſelves to copy the ſilly Fictions of Ægypt, and having made a Golden Calf after the Pattern of an Animal eſteemed the moſt ſacred in that Country, they offered impious Sacrifices, accompanied with abominable dancing and ſinging* [d]. Which, as all Men of Learning obſerve, are the very Inſtances of the Worſhip paid to the *God Apis* [a]. *Monſieur Rollin*, in his ſhort Hiſtory of the *Ancient Ægyptians*, ſays, *that the Golden Calf ſet up by the Iſraelites, was the effect of their Abode in Ægypt, and an Imitation of their God Apis, as well as thoſe which were afterwads ſet up by Jeroboam* [b]. And a Proteſtant Author quoted above, who never allows any thing that an orthodox Man can poſſibly deny, yet owns, that it was *in Imitation of the Ægyptian Apis, that the Golden Calf was made in the Wilderneſs* [c].

---

[a] Οθεν δὴ καὶ τὸ προφερόμενον ἡμῖν ὑπό τινων ἔγκλημα, τὸ δὴ μὴ καινῶν εὑρετὰς, &c. Joſ. ibid. c. 20.

[b] Reply, p. 46.

[c] Hanc opinionem adſtruit Philo, Targum Hieroſolymitanum, Lactantius, Hieronymus, Kircherus, Bochartus, & Auctores ab eo citati, quibus accedit Grotius, &c. Spencer de Leg. Heb. l. 1. p. 21.

[d] Philo de Vita Moſ. p. 677.

But *ſhould we admit*, you ſay, that the *Ægyptian Apis was worſhipped as early, as I repreſent it, yet there are no grounds from Scripture Story to conclude, that the Golden Calf in the Wilderneſs had any Reference to that Worſhip :* Or that the *God or Gods which the Jews intended to worſhip under that Image, were any Ægyptian Gods* [d]. Now this ſhews the little Acquaintance you have with Scripture, as well as the little Attention you pay to Reaſon and the Senſe of Things: The *Iſraelites* had no ſooner got clear of the *Ægyptians*, than they fell to the making and worſhipping of *Idols :* The Queſtion is, what *ſort of Idols* it was, that they were ſo fond of worſhipping: And does not Senſe and Reaſon, and even Neceſſity teach us that they could be no other, than what they had been ſo long acquainted with, and worſhipping for about two hundred Years before? For the learned *Spencer* has ſhewn, that during their Abode in *Ægypt*, they complied with *all the Cuſtoms and Idolatry of the Country* [e]. But *there's no ground*, you ſay, *from Scripture Story to make this Concluſion :* This is ſtill ſtranger, that one who undertakes to defend *Scripture* with ſuch Gravity, ſhould betray ſo great an Ignorance of *Scripture Story :*

---

[a] Probatione id non indiget; cum & ritus in conflando vitulo adhibiti, tripudia, convivia chori, &c. id ſatis ſuperque demonſtrent—Kircher. Oedip. Ægyp. T. 1. p. 300. It. Spenc. ib.

[b] See Antient Hiſt. of the Ægyp. done into Engl. p. 42.

[c] Itaque credibile eſt jam antiquitùs tempore Iſraelitarum fuiſſe Idolum, cujus imitamine vitulum in deſerto fecerunt—Leidek. de Rep. Hebr. p. 150.

[d] Reply, p. 47.

[e] De Leg. Hebr. l. 1. p. 20.

For nothing is more clear and certain or more frequently inculcated in *Scripture Story*, than that the *Idolatry*, by which they ſo oft provoked God to puniſh them, and their Leaders and Prophets to reproach them, was ſuch as *their Fathers had learnt and practiſed in Ægypt.* To give an Inſtance or two out of many.

Joſhua, a little before his Death, very pathetically exhorts them, *to put away the Gods, which their Fathers ſerved on the other ſide of the Flood and in Ægypt* [a]. And when they were in Poſſeſſion of the promiſed Land, the ſame Inclination to the *Idols of Ægypt* ſtill continued, as we find by the Reproofs of all the *Prophets*, on this very Account. *Then ſaid I unto them, caſt ye away every Man the Abominations of his Eyes, and defile not your ſelves with the Idols of Ægypt. But they rebelled againſt me—neither did they forſake the Idols of Ægypt* [b]. All which is confirmed again by the Teſtimony of St. *Stephen*, if that have any weight with you, who mentions this very Caſe of the *Golden Calf*, as an Example and Proof of *their turning back again in their Hearts into Ægypt* [c].

The *ſecond Miſtake* you urge me with on this Head, is for aſſerting *Kircher to have ſhewn, that Hieroglyphicks or the ſacred Characters of Ægypt were invented and uſed before Moſes's Time.* But Sir *Iſaac*, you ſay, *has ſhewn the contrary*; *that Thoth, the reputed Inventor of thoſe Hieroglyphicks was Contemporary with Seſoſtris or Shiſac, who plundered the Temple of Jeruſalem in the Reign of Rehoboam: And that Moſes therefore could not borrow, as I intimate, the Hieroglyphick of the Serpent from the Ægyptians* [d]. And here the Reader will obſerve another remarkable Inſtance of what I have more than once mentioned, *viz.* your raſh and partial way of forming your Notions from *Scraps* and *ſeparate Quotations*, without conſidering with any Care the very Authors you moſt admire. For tho' Sir *Iſaac* aſſerts *Thoth*, who lived according to his Account in the time of *Solomon*, to have been *the Inventor of common Letters and Writing* [e], yet he is ſo far from aſcribing to him the Invention of *Hieroglyphicks*, that he declares in expreſs terms, that the *Hieroglyphical way of writing ſeems to have ſpread into lower Ægypt before the Days of Moſes, and that ſome Reference is made to it in the ſecond Commandment, which prohibits the worſhipping of God under the Shape of Birds, Beaſts and Fiſhes* [a].

---

[a] Joſh. xxiv. 14.

[b] Ezek. xix. 7, 8.

[c] Act. vii. 39.

[d] Reply, p. 48.

[e] Newt. Chron. p. 210.

I ſhall conclude this Article with a Paſſage from Dr. *Spencer*, who has examined this Queſtion with more Diligence, and treated it with more Learning and Judgment than any Man. *The myſtical way of Writing in uſe with the Ægyptians, bears much Reſemblance*, ſays he, *to that of the Hebrews.* This he confirms by the Authority of *Franciſcus Valeſius*, and *Clemens of Alexandria*, and then ſubjons the following Remark. *Whence comes it then, that this Ænigmatical Stile of the Ægyptians and the Hebrews is found ſo exactly alike; but that God had ſo contrived his Law and its ſacred Rites, that they might ſuit, as far as was poſſible, the Taſte and Uſage of that Age? For no Man who has any good Judgment can think, that the Ægyptians were in this Caſe the Diſciples and Followers of the Jews; ſince 'tis allowed on all hands, that the Hieroglyphical Literature was ancienter than Moſes, and that the Ægyptians long before his Time uſed to cover their ſacred Doctrines under the Veil of Symbols and Myſtical Figures* [b].

And thus, Sir, after all Sir *Iſaac's Demonſtrations*, and your Deſcant upon them, I ſhall once more venture to affirm, *that Ægypt was in Moſes's Time a great and flouriſhing Kingdom, a learned and polite Nation.*

The laſt *Hiſtorical Fact*, you take notice of, *advanced*, as you ſay [c], *againſt the Truth*, is *the Confuſion of Languages at Babel.* But how is this a Fact of my advancing? I have indeed made an Obſervation or two on the common way of explaining it; and 'tis this you conteſt with me, contrary to your own Declaration; not the *Fact* itſelf, but *my Reaſoning* about it. Which ſhews, as I've already hinted, the low Shifts you are put to, to blow up the Envy and Clamour you would raiſe againſt me.

---

[a] Ibid. p. 225.

[b] De Legib. Heb. L. 1. c. 15. p. 211, 212.

[c] Rep. p. 51.

And here I muſt again put the Reader in mind, that I am far from forming, as you call it, any *peremptory Judgment againſt the Moſaic Story of Babel* [*a*]. All that I attempted in *my Letter*, was to ſhew the Raſhneſs and Imprudence of Dr. *Waterland*'s way of defending it, in denying all *manner of probability* or *colour of Reaſon* to any Objections that could be made to it: And as I have proved againſt the *Doctor* and yourſelf, that the *diſperſion of Mankind* and *peopling of the World*, muſt of courſe be the certain and neceſſary effect of an *encreaſing Multitude*, flowing from the Reaſon and Nature of Things, excluſive of any *Miracle or the extraordinary Interpoſition of God*; ſo what I pretend to ſhew now, is, that the *Variety of Languages* may with *ſome colour of Reaſon and Probability* be accounted for too in the ſame way, as the natural and neceſſary Conſequence of ſuch Diſperſion.

Let's conſider Mankind in its infant State, as yet but one Family, tho' daily growing and encreaſing ſo faſt, as to be forced in Proportion to that Encreaſe to break off and ſeparate from each other into ſeveral Parties or Colonies in queſt of freſh Quarters and Proviſions. That this muſt needs be the caſe of ſuch a Multitude has already been ſhewn from the Nature of Things; and 'twas from the ſame Neceſſity of Nature, that the *Nations of the Earth were divided or peopled*, as the *Scripture* ſays, *by the Sons of Noah* [*b*].

Now as this Diſperſion muſt have happened, whilſt Mankind was yet rude and barbarous, unacquainted with Arts and Sciences, and even the common Inventions and Conveniencies of Life; ſo the Production of ſuch Arts, the Improvement of Knowledge and Science, and the new Demands of Life daily ariſing muſt neceſſarily produce a *new Language* in each ſingle Nation or ſeparate People, unknown in a great meaſure to the reſt of their Fellow Creatures. For as Names are generally but arbitrary Signs, not drawn from the Nature or Qualities of the Things themſelves, but formed by Fancy or Accident and confirmed by Uſe; ſo every thing new muſt neceſſarily create not onely a new Name, but a different one too from what the ſame thing, when invent ed, would obtain in a different People.

[*a*] Rep. p. 52.

[*b*] Gen. x. 32.

And thus a Difference of Languages being once eſtabliſhed, the Mixture and Compoſition of ſeveral of them together, which follows of courſe from Conqueſts and the familiar Intercourſe of different Nations, is another inexhauſtible Source and Cauſe of multiplying that ſame Variety; juſt as the various changing and mixing the different Sounds of Bells produce an infinite Variation and Diſtinction of their Muſick.

This ſhort Hint of the *Origin of Languages* may ſuffice to ſhew the Folly of your aſſerting it to be *impoſſible, that there could have been ſuch a Variety of them in the World, unleſs from ſome ſuch Confuſion as happened at Babel* [a]. The Reaſon you alledge for that *Impoſſibility* is trifling, without any Foundation in Fact or Truth: For you ſay, that if no ſuch Miracle had happened, the *things which are of moſt common uſe in Life, and which all Men are every Day ſpeaking of, could never have come in different Languages to be expreſſed by Words, which have not the leaſt Affinity with one another.* But do not we ſee the ſame thing to have actually happened in all the modern Languages of the World, that are as it were but of Yeſterday's riſe and ſtanding; that by mixing and blending the Sounds of concurring Nations *new Names* have been formed for the *moſt neceſſary Things of Life*, as well as the moſt obvious Parts of the Body?

One Part of *Italy* anciently called the *Mouth, Stoma*; the other Part, *Os*: now all call it *Bocca*; in French *Bouche.*

One Part called the *Eye*, *Ophthalmus*; the other *Oculus*: all now call it *Occhio*; in French *Oeil.*

One Part called the *Ear*, *Ouar*; the other *Auris*: all now *Orecchio*; in French *Oreille*, &c.

---

[a] Reply, p. 52.

Now the grand Queſtion you aſk is, What *could tempt Men to create new Words, where they had old ones before, eſpecially in things of common uſe, whoſe Names were every Day in every Man's Mouth?* The Anſwer is very eaſy: It was the natural and neceſſary Mutability of all human Things, that forced them by degrees to change their *old Words* for the more prevailing Sounds of ſuch People, as had then got the Superiority or principal Rule in the Country; an Effect that will always follow the ſame Cauſe: And ſhould *Italy* or *France* be again conquered by *Barbarians, Tartars, Turks,* &c. a *new Language* would neceſſarily ariſe from ſuch an Event; and *new Names* for the moſt common Things of Life, neither *Barbarian* nor *Italian*, but a Jumble and Mixture of both.

And thus, Sir, I have gone thro' all your Cavils to *my Letter*, without finding the leaſt Proof or Overt-act of the *Infidelity* you charge me with, beſides my daring to differ from Dr. *Waterland and yourſelf* about the Mode of explaining ſome Circumſtances of the *Moſaic Hiſtory*. One great Part of the *Letter* you make ſo free with is employed in Defence of the *Chriſtian Religion* againſt *Infidelity*; on ſuch a Plan as I then thought and ſtill think the moſt effectual to confute the Author I had to do with, and expoſe the Vanity of thoſe Principles by which he hopes to overturn Chriſtianity: And as *our Saviour himſelf*, when charged abſurdly with the *caſting out of Devils by the Power of the Devil*, ſhews the Folly of that Calumny by one plain Obſervation, that *a Houſe divided againſt itſelf cannot ſtand*; ſo 'tis ſilly and abſurd to imagine, that I ſhould take ſuch Pains to deſtroy the Credit of a Writer, who deſerves ſo well of *Infidels*, had I been of the Number myſelf, or inclined to liſt into that Service. But I am ſo far from favouring *Infidelity*, that I ſhould be heartily glad to ſee an Anſwer to *Chriſtianity as Old* &c. on a better Plan and Foundation than what I have propoſed: But as I am very certain, that this has not yet been done by Dr. *Waterland*; ſo I am as ſure, by the Specimen you have given us, that it can never be done by yourſelf.

As I am a Stranger to your Name and Character, and have no other Light to form a Judgment of you by, but the Merit of the Piece I have been examining; ſo your injurious and inſolent manner of treating me in that Piece, as an *Infidel and an Enemy to Chriſtianity*; a *wilful Depraver of Facts and Quotations*, will fully juſtify any Freedom or Severity of Expreſſion I may have uſed in this neceſſary Defence of myſelf; in which, however, if I have done you any Injuſtice, I ſhall always be ready, upon better Information and Acquaintance with you, to make you all the Amends and Satisfaction, that can be required from one, who in this, as well as every other Controverſy, he may be engaged in, profeſſes to have no other Motive, View or Intention whatſoever, than to ſearch freely and impartially for the Truth.

SOME REMARKS ON A REPLY TO THE DEFENCE of the LETTER TO Dr. *WATERLAND.*

Wherein the Author's Sentiments, as to all the principal Points in Diſpute, are fully and clearly explained in the Manner that has been promiſed.

> *The Intendment of my Diſcourſe is, that Permiſſion ſhould be in Queſtions ſpeculative, indeterminable, curious and unneceſſary; and that Men would not make more Neceſſities than God made: which indeed are not many. The Fault I find and ſeek to remedy is, that Men are ſo dogmatical and reſolute in their Opinions, and impatient of others Diſagreeings in thoſe Things, wherein are no ſufficient Means of Union and Determination: but that Men ſhould let Opinions and Problems keep their own Forms, and not be obtruded as Axioms; nor Queſtions in the vaſt Collection of the Syſtem of Divinity be adopted into the Family of Faith: and I think I have Reaſon to deſire this.*
>
> *Taylor* Lib. of Propheſ. Ep. Dedic. *p.* 12.

SOME REMARKS ON A REPLY TO THE DEFENCE of the LETTER TO Dr. *WATERLAND*.

SIR,

YOU begin *your Reply* by obſerving; *that it was near twelve months before the Defence of my Letter appeared in print:* yet you make *no exceptions,* you ſay, *to the length of time.* To what purpoſe then do you ſet out with an obſervation ſo impertinent? Why; to introduce another much more ſo; *that a longer time would have paſt, before you could have prevailed with your ſelf to have publiſhed ſuch a Defence.* And for that matter, you need not be in any pain; every reader, I dare ſay, will allow it; that had you taken *twice twelve months,* it would not have been in your power to have produced *ſuch an one.*

The next paragraph gives us a taſte of *your vanity:* for you cannot hold out *ten lines,* without informing the reader, that you have forced me to *recant and plead guilty* to the charge of a *falſe* *quotation:* and leſt it ſhould be forgotten, you repeat it a few pages after, and once more *renew your triumph* over me [*a*]. And here, whatever credit it gives you, or whatever ſhame it brings to myſelf, I muſt confeſs it to be true; that I have *recanted*, and *owned myſelf guilty of quoting falſly*, as you ſay, or as others will think, *too negligently*, in one inſtance: and had it been proved upon me in many more, would have owned it as readily: nor am I deſirous to give any check to your pleaſure, by obſerving, that it was in a point of no conſequence; for had it been of much greater, I ſhould have retracted the more freely: the onely uſe I ſhall make of it, is to ſhew the difference of your conduct and mine on this occaſion: for, pray Sir, what is it in this controverſy that you have retracted? Have you in any one inſtance *pleaded guilty*, or owned yourſelf confuted? No, you *inſiſt upon it, that you have advanced nothing raſhly in your whole Reply* [*b*]; *that you have made good every ſingle inſtance of falſhood charged upon me.*

As to the truth of what you *inſiſt upon*; we ſhall be better able to judge of it by and by: in the mean while, as I am here conſidering the difference of your temper and mine, as to *pleading guilty* on fair conviction; I ſhall out of many inſtances, produce onely *three* or *four*, in which you ought at leaſt to have *pleaded guilty*; for if you have the Learning you pretend to, you muſt know yourſelf to be confuted; if the love of Truth and Religion, muſt know it your duty to confeſs it.

1. I had produced in *my Letter* a teſtimony of St. *Stephen*, to prove, that the *Ægyptians were poſſeſſed of learning in Moſes's time* [*c*]. This teſtimony you treated with *ſuch raſhneſs*, as gave me occaſion to charge you with overturning the very Foundations and *betraying the very Citadel of Revealed Religion* [*d*]; by ſuppoſing that a perſon *full of the Holy Ghoſt*, and under the *actual influence of a Divine Spirit*, could poſſibly aſſert any thing *erroneous:* and in this I was ſupported by the expreſs declaration of Dr. *Waterland* himſelf, whoſe Defence you had undertaken.

[*a*] Reply to Defence, p. 25.

[*b*] Ibid. p. 3, 4.

[*c*] Letter, p. 23.

[*d*] Defence, p. 71.

Now what do you reply to this? Why, nothing at all directly; but mutter onely ſomewhat in a *parentheſis* [a]; as if St. *Stephen, when filled with the Holy Ghoſt, might yet conſiſtently affirm what was falſe of facts, that have no relation to the Chriſtian doctrine.* Which is to allow in effect, that he might be *full of the Holy Ghoſt*, and *full of error*; *full of truth*, and *full of falſhood* too at the ſame time: a poſition, which *no Chriſtian* will preſume to defend; and which if I had but darkly hinted, the uſual titles of *Freethinker* and *Infidel* would have been thought too ſoft for me. As in the caſe then of St. *Stephen*, all people were ſcandalized at *your raſhneſs*; ſo your conduct would have been more edifying to the lovers of *Truth and Religion*, and more ſuitable to the zeal you pretend for both, had you endeavoured to repair *that Scandal*, by acknowledging your *error*, and *pleading guilty* to it; and not thro' a *falſe pride and vanity*, which every man muſt contemn, ſought to bear down all before you, *by inſiſting, that you have advanced nothing raſhly.*

2. As to the fact itſelf, of the *learning and politeneſs of the* Ægyptians *in* Moſes's *time*: after all your cry againſt me for *the falſhood of my hiſtorical facts*, it proved at laſt the *onely one*, in which you attempted to fix that charge upon me, by the help of what you call *Sir* Iſaac Newton's *demonſtrations and diſcoveries*; where he has, as you declare, *demonſtrated my notions to be falſe* [b]. In anſwer to this I have evinced the truth of my opinion ſo undeniably, from the teſtimony of *all hiſtory*, both *ſacred and prophane*; that every reader, I dare ſay, is convinced of it, and you yourſelf in fact allow it, by *leaving me in poſſeſſion of the queſtion* [c]. But you do it with ſo ill a grace, with ſo much reluctance and ſhuffling about it, as takes off all the credit of *a liberal and ingenuous* conceſſion. For after you had *raſhly* advanced *the authority of Sir* Iſaac above *Scripture* itſelf, which cannot poſſibly be true, unleſs his *Demonſtrations*, as you call them, be falſe; inſtead of taking any blame to yourſelf, you throw it all upon me,

---

[a] Reply to Defence, p. 81.

[b] Reply, p. 45.

[c] Reply to Defence, p. 42.

for expoſing that raſhneſs and defending Scripture: for you labour to raiſe a clamour and envy againſt me for *inſulting Sir* Iſaac; and with your *uſual rhetorick* movingly exclaim, *how low is the great* Newton *fallen! how ignorant in your opinion!* I have already declared my opinion of him to be *as great*, as I can poſſibly have of any *mortal:* yet the honour I have for his name muſt not deprive me of the privilege of judging for myſelf in all queſtions, that I am capable of underſtanding; and of thinking differently even from Sir *Iſaac*, or any man elſe, as oft as the force of reaſons obliges me.

You diſmiſs the queſtion by aſſuring me, that *whenever I ſhall be inclined to treat it more fully, there ſhall not want one, who will attempt to do juſtice to Sir* Iſaac's *proofs*; and with this promiſe you *leave me*, as you ſay, *in poſſeſſion of it.* But is not this a poor childiſh evaſion; the ſtale ſhift of thoſe, who having nothing to ſay or give, refer themſelves to another time? Will the reader believe, that you would have *left me in poſſeſſion* of any thing, you could have wreſted from me? much leſs of a queſtion, which bears the greateſt ſhew of Learning, of any in the Controverſy; and of that *ſingle hiſtorical Fact*, which you have charged me *with falſifying?* If you had any real intention *to do juſtice to Sir* Iſaac's *proofs*, why did you not do it here; when it was your buſineſs to do it, when you were challenged to do it? I have entered fully and freely into an examination of them; have produced all I had to offer on the ſubject; which, however *ſlight* you declare it to be, will be thought by every body elſe ſufficient and effectual to confute you: nay, what's worſe; you plainly diſcover, that you think ſo yourſelf; and ſtand condemned in your own mind, and puniſhed by a *ſilly pride*, that will not give you leave to own yourſelf in the wrong.

3. You charged me *in your Reply* [a], with *falſly aſſerting the Golden Calf in the Wilderneſs to have been made in imitation of the* Ægyptian Apis; and affirmed withal, that there was *no ground*

---

[a] Reply, p. 46.

in Scripture-ſtory for my notion [*a*]. In anſwer to which I obſerved, that the God *Apis* was worſhipped in the *ſame form*, and with the *ſame ceremonies* as the *Golden Calf:* and that I had with me the concurrence of all the learned, who had touched this queſtion, as well as of the *moſt zealous and orthodox defenders* of Chriſtianity. And from *Scripture-ſtory* I ſhewed; that the *Idolatry*, by which the *Iſralites* ſo often provoked God, is ſaid to be ſuch as *their Fathers had learned and practiſed in* Ægypt; that the Idols they were fond of, even at the time of making the *Golden Calf*, are deſcribed as *Ægyptian ones*; and that St. *Stephen* alledges this very caſe of the *Calf*, as an inſtance of their *turning back in their hearts into* Ægypt [*b*]. Now can there be *any greater raſhneſs* in a *Scholar*, than roundly to deny what men of learning from the reaſon of the thing and the teſtimony of hiſtory have been obliged to aſſert? Can there be *any greater* in a *Divine*, than to affirm, that *there's no ground in Scripture-ſtory*, for what is ſo clearly confirmed by *many texts of Scripture?*

What then have you ſaid to this in *your Reply?* Why, without giving any anſwer to *my Authorities*, or any other account of my *Scripture texts*; without alledging any *new* Reaſons, or confuting the *old* ones; you ſtick firm to your point, and tell us plainly, that what you before ſaid, *you ſtill aſſert, that there are no grounds from Scripture-ſtory, to think the Golden Calf to have been made in imitation of the* Ægyptian Apis [*c*]. How is it poſſible to deal with ſuch a Writer, whoſe maxim, as oft as confuted, is to *aſſert ſtill, and inſiſt that he has advanced nothing raſhly?*

4. But the next inſtance is ſtill the moſt flagrant. In *your Reply to my Letter, you will mention*, you ſay, *but one miſtake more of mine under this article:* very modeſt truly, to mention *but one*, where with the ſame truth you might have mentioned *twenty*. The miſtake is; that I had aſſerted on the authority of the learned, that *Hieroglyphicks or ſacred Characters were uſed in* Ægypt *before*

[*a*] Ibid. p. 47.

[*b*] Defence, p 83, 84. *See* Jerem. ii. 18. Ezek. xvi. 26. xxiii. 3, 8.

[*c*] Reply to Defence, p. 43.

Moſes: whereas you affirm, *Sir* Iſaac *to have ſhewn that they were not ſo much as invented till the reign of* Rehoboam [a]. To this I anſwered, that Sir *Iſaac* was ſo far from having ſhewn what you affirmed of him, that he had directly ſhewn the contrary; had expreſly allowed the very thing I aſſerted, that *Hieroglyphicks were in uſe in the days of* Moſes [b].

And what have you *replied* to this? not *one ſyllable.* But will not every one reflect on what you ought to have *replied?* Ought you not to have recalled the miſtake, *ſo raſhly* charged on me, and taken it to yourſelf? and the more readily, for being ſo groſs an one? Ought you not rather to have done any thing than *aſſert* and *inſiſt* with ſuch aſſurance that you *had advanced nothing raſhly*; that *every ſingle inſtance of falſhood was made good againſt me* [c]? 'Tis ſuch perverſeneſs and diſingenuity as this that confirms men in *Scepticiſm*, inſtead of convincing them; by *inſiſting* for ever on exploded nonſenſe and cramming down people's throats what all men of ſenſe muſt nauſeate. Is it poſſible after this to expect any thing candid or impartial from you in the way of argument? no, we ſhall not be deceived; you preſerve a true unity of character through your whole performance; 'tis all of a piece; equal and uniform to itſelf from one end to the other:

——Servatur ad imum,
Qualis ab incepto proceſſerit, & ſibi conſtat.

To illuſtrate it a little farther:

The deſign of *your Reply*, as 'tis declared by yourſelf, was to ſet forth the *falſhood of my Quotations and Hiſtorical Facts:* and your very *Title Page and Introduction* prepared us to expect that you would make good your charge againſt *them all.* Yet I obſerved, that when you came to the particulars, all you attempted to cavil at were *fifteen out of fourſcore*; and that even *two* of that number had *no reference to any quotation at all.* Let's juſt conſider, what you have *replied* to this. As to the *two inſtances* I exclude from your *liſt* you are content, it ſeems, to exclude them too and *change the name if I do not like it* [a]: but why then were they added to the *account of Quotations*, when they had no relation to it, unleſs to enflame and enhance a *falſe charge?* You ſay withal, that you did not intend to attack *all my Quotations*, but *my original ones onely* [b]. And by the inſtances you give, one would imagine, that by *original*, you mean *Latin* and *Greek* ones: as if my *Engliſh quotations*, which you do not meddle with, were not as truly *original* as thoſe taken from *Herodotus*. But you define more diſtinctly your ſenſe of *original ones*; telling us, that they are ſuch, as I have not taken *at ſecond hand on the authority of other writers*; *for you never meant to charge me with ſecond hand Quotations, knowing that if they are falſe, the Authors I take them from are anſwerable for the falſhood of them.* Why then do you charge me with one drawn from *Maimonides*, on the *authority of* Spencer; and which *Spencer*, you ſay, *took from* Buxtorf [c]? Is not this by your own definition *doubly a ſecond handed one?* Why do you charge to my account likewiſe [d] another taken from *the Rabbins*, on the *authority of* Lightfoot? Is not this too *a ſecond hand Quotation?* So that *your Reply* in this caſe, as in moſt others, is ſo ſhuffling and inconſiſtent, as ſhews you determined at all adventures rather to defend every thing *raſhly*, than yield up any thing *ingenuouſly*.

---

[a] Reply, p. 48.

[b] Defence, p. 87.

[c] Reply to Defence, p. 4.

'Tis not worth while to follow you again thro' all the cavils of *your firſt Reply*, which you now repeat and inſiſt on in *your ſecond*. A Controverſy would be the buſineſs of life, if we muſt treat it at this rate, and dwell for ever on the ſame facts. I have already ſaid enough on each, and am content to leave the merit of it to the judgment of the reader: however, to ſhew you that I have no other reaſon for declining any debate or argument you offer, but meerly to ſave time and cut ſhort unneceſſary ſquabbles,

---

[a] Reply to Def. p. 32.

[b] Ib. p. 6.

[c] Ib. p. 28.

[d] Ib. p. 30.

I ſhall run over again with you *two or three* of your inſtances, where you fancy yourſelf the ſtrongeſt, or have added ſome *new force* to your former exceptions.

You urge then afreſh in *your ſecond Reply*, with regard to what I have quoted from *Cicero*; *that* Cicero's *true Sentiments are not to be found under the character of his Academic Speakers* [a]: and tell us withall, *that it was on this very Article that the Author of the Diſcourſe on Free-thinking received ſuch chaſtiſement from* Phileleutherus Lipſienſis, *that you never expected to ſee any one ſo ventureſome, as to aſſert the ſame thing again.* And I readily allow, that the *Free-thinker* you mention received a very proper correction from *Phileleutherus Lipſienſis*; whoſe great learning likewiſe I am as ready as yourſelf to acknowledge: but I aſſure you, Sir, that at the time of writing *My Letter*, I did not recollect what either of thoſe Authors had ſaid on the Subject; but uſed on this, as on all other occaſions, the right I claim of judging for myſelf: yet I am apt to think, that the *Learned Writer* we are ſpeaking of, either does not inſiſt ſo much, as you imagine, on what he has advanced, or thinks it at leaſt conſiſtent with the uſe I make of *Cicero*, from the principle he himſelf lays down; *that the reaſoning is the ſame, from whatever quarter it comes, and the Authority not the leſs, though transferred from* Cicero *to a Stoic* [b]; for 'tis very credibly reported, that on reading *My Letter to Dr. Waterland*, before any name had been mentioned of the ſupported Author, he did in very ſtrong terms expreſs his approbation of it.

But to return to the queſtion: *Cicero* is allowed on all hands to have been a *profeſſed and ſincere follower of the Academy*: this he declares, in every part of his Works, aud owns himſelf indebted for all the *Talents and Abilities* he was maſter of, to the precepts and principles of *that Philoſophy*. Where then are we to look for his *real Sentiments* on any queſtion; but where that queſtion is treated profeſſedly and elaborately according to *the principles and maxims of the Academy?* This is the caſe in his *ſecond Book of Divination*, where he diſputes in his own perſon; and where he declares, that the *chief purpoſe of that Diſputation was to explode Superſtition; as it was likewiſe in his other Book of the Nature of the Gods* [*a*]*:* which is not applicable to any other part in *this Book*, but that onely, which *Cotta* ſuſtains. Dr. *W.* tells us, *that* Tully'*s Diſputants* in theſe *very Books, De natura Deorum, & de Divinatione, debate in good earneſt, and repreſent the ſenſe of the ſeveral contending parties to the beſt advantage* [*b*]. And if ſo, then the Sentiments affirmed by *Cotta*, muſt be conſidered as the Sentiments of *Cicero* himſelf, as they were the Senſe of the *Academic party repreſented to the beſt advantage*.

---

[a] Reply to Defence, p. 8.

[b] Remarks on Diſcourſe of Free-thinking, Part II. p. 78.

And as to the declaration, that *Cicero* makes in the end of *this Dialogue* in favour of the *Stoicks*; I am ſtill of opinion, that it may be conſidered as *a complement to* Brutus; to whom this very Book is addreſſed; by giving a ſlight preference to *his Philoſophy*; tho' himſelf at the ſame time *really followed and preferred* another kind [*c*]. But this you call *ſtrange*, and wonder how I can ſuppoſe Cicero *to have complimented with ſuch inſincerity* [*d*]. But 'tis more *ſtrange*, to hear a man of gravity talking ſo childiſhly. For what is it, I would know, that you take *Cicero* to have been? Some *Bigot perhaps in Religion*; who reckoned it a point of Conſcience, not to depart a tittle from the rigour of his principles: or ſome *Pedant in Letters*; who thought it a diminution to his character, not to aſſert on all occaſions the ſupreme prerogative of his own judgment. No, Sir, I impute no *inſincerity to him*, but what is ſuitable to his high merit and character, ſuch as would diſpoſe him, for the eaſe and politeneſs of converſation, not to inſiſt always on the ſtrictneſs of his Sentiments, but to yield up ſomewhat even of his own perſuaſion, to do a civility or pleaſure to his Friend: A behaviour, which, however *ſtrange* to you, will hardly do him diſcredit with any body elſe.

[*a*] De Div. l. 2. cap. ult.

[*b*] Script. Vind. Part II. p. 7.

[*c*] Quod genus Philoſophiæ minime arrogans, maximèque & conſtans & elegans arbitraremur, quatuor Academicis libris oſtendimus, *de Div. l.* 2 1.

[*d*] Reply to Defence, p. 10.

But the words I quoted are ſo far, you ſay, from giving *Cicero's opinion,* that they do not ſo much as repreſent *Cotta*'s, who ſpeaks them: This notion I have already treated as it deſerves [*a*]: but you inſiſt upon it again, and enforce it by a new proof, drawn from what *Cotta* in the cloſe of his argument ſays to *his Antagoniſt*; *facile me a te vinci poſſe, certò ſcio.* From which you infer, that Cotta*'s approbation of the Sentiments he had been aſſerting, is inconſiſtent with the declaration he makes of his knowing for certain that* Balbus *could confute him* [*b*]. And here again you fall into the ſame miſtake of treating *a meer compliment,* as if it were a *ſolemn and categorical* affirmation. *A mere compliment,* I ſay; which every body who knows any thing of good manners or good ſenſe will ſee at once to be ſuch: though 'tis, I'm perſuaded, *ſuch an one,* as you will never make, of allowing any man *able to confute you.* *Cotta,* in cloſing his argument, throws it into the hands of *Balbus,* in a polite manner, by declaring, that *he knew it to be in his power to confute him with eaſe:* A civil turn of expreſſion; very common on all occaſions of eaſy debate, whether publick or private: yet you argue from *the ſtrict ſenſe* of the words, as if *Cotta* were declaring his *ſtrict Sentiments:* in which you contradict the very authority you follow, of *Phileleutherus* himſelf, who ſays, that in this very *Book of the Nature of the Gods, none of the diſputants concede*; all ſtand firm to their principles [*c*]. Beſides; whilſt you lay ſo much ſtreſs on theſe words, and aſſert them *ſtrictly* to bear, that *Cotta knew for certain,* &c. you forget what you had allowed the page before, that it was the peculiar character of the *Academy to know nothing for certain.*

Again; to ſhew that the part aſſigned to *Cotta* did in fact contain *Cicero's real Sentiments,* I obſerved, that in his *ſecond Book of*

[*a*] Defence, p. 10.

[*b*] Reply to Defence, p. 11.

[*c*] Remarks on Diſcourſe of Freethink. Part II. p. 73.

Divination, where he diſputes in his own perſon, he takes the ſame ſide and uſes the ſame arguments, to confute the opinions of the Stoics *about Religion and Divination* [*a*]. And here, after puzzling a while to find out my meaning, you ſuppoſe it at laſt to be, that *Cicero in this Book had diſputed againſt Religion:* which you affirm *to be falſe*, and produce *Cicero*'s *own words* to prove it [*b*]. But whatever you affirm, or whatever you take *Cicero* to mean, I here again declare; that *Cicero in his ſecond Book of Divination diſputes againſt Religion*, as it was explained and underſtood by the *Stoicks*; who held *Divination* to be an *eſſential and principal part* of it. *If there are Gods, there is Divination*, was fundamental with them; as you might have learnt from *Cicero* himſelf, who calls this very Article, *the fortreſs or citadel of the Stoical Religion* [*c*]. And to diſpute againſt *Divination* was not onely to diſpute againſt *the Religion of the Stoicks*, but againſt the *popular or eſtabliſhed Religion too*; which, as every one knows, was founded on the ſuppoſition of *the truth of Divination*, and moſt of *its offices and ceremonies* inſtituted on that ſole foundation, which muſt of courſe fall to the ground, were *Divination* taken away [*d*].

But how then, you'll ſay, are we to underſtand *Cicero*, when he declares in this ſame Book, that he has no deſign *to take away Religion?* Very eaſily; by conſidering him onely as talking like a *Philoſopher:* that though he was confuting the *ſuperſtitious notions of the* Stoicks, yet he did not mean by that to deſtroy *the Religion of Reaſon and Nature*, founded in the belief *of a God and his Providence:* and though he declared for preſerving *the Rites and Ceremonies eſtabliſhed by their Anceſtors*; yet it was for reaſons of policy, and the ends of government onely; not that he thought them any part of *the true and rational Religion*, which men of ſenſe ought to follow [*e*].

[*a*] Defence, p. 9.

[*b*] Reply to Defence. p. 9.

[*c*] Arcem tu quidem Stoicorum, Quinte, defendis, ſi quidem iſta ſic reciprocantur; ut &, ſi divinatio ſit, Dii ſint, & ſi Dii ſint, ſit divinatio, *de Div. l.* 1. 6.

[*d*] Cum omnis populi Romani religio in Sacra & in Auſpicia diviſa ſit; tertium adjunctum ſit, ſi quid prædictionis cauſa ex portentis & monſtris Sybillæ interpretes, Haruſpiceſve monuerunt, *Nat. Deor.* 3. 2.

[*e*] Nam & majorum inſtituta tueri ſacris

You proceed to enforce an exception of yours, to a quotation from *Joſephus*, about the uſe of *Circumciſion in Ægypt*. Where I muſt recommend one general remark to the reader, and deſire him to apply to *all your Cavils* of this kind; *viz.* that if on any occaſion, thro' haſte or eagerneſs, I have laid more ſtreſs on any *teſtimony*, than it will ſtrictly and ſingly bear, yet 'tis always in caſes, where I have either ſupported *the ſame fact by other full and clear authorities*, or where 'tis allowed and notorious, that it can be ſo ſupported. So that whatever may be objected to the exactneſs of *any particular quotation*, it makes no alteration in the ſtate of the queſtion itſelf. This will be explained by the inſtance before us.

I had quoted *Herodotus*, *Diodorus Siculus*, *Strabo*, to prove, that *Circumciſion was univerſally practiſed by the Ægyptians*; in confirmation of which, I added likewiſe a paſſage of *Joſephus*; that does not, it ſeems, come up to the very point of *univerſal practice*: now without taking any notice of the other authorities, which eſtabliſh the fact, you catch hold of this; run away with the cry of *falſe quotation*; and fancying, that you have got the reader on your ſide, and can now perſuade him to any thing, you preſently form an *Hypotheſis* out of your own brain; that *the Ægyptian Prieſts onely were circumciſed*; *that theſe Prieſts taught the Prieſts of other nations to be ſo too*; *and that it was not for the ſake of cleanlineſs, as I tranſlate* καθαριότητος, *but of purity*; *juſt as it was among the Jews* [a]. All which particulars I have ſeverally conſidered and confuted [b]. But this rude way of confuting does not pleaſe you; you call it *dropping the queſtion and drawing off the reader from the charge brought againſt me* [c]. And 'tis indeed drawing off his attention from *words*, to *things*; from *trifles*, to

---

cris cæremoniiſque retinendis ſapientis eſt: & eſſe præſtantem aliquam, æternamque naturam & eam ſuſpiciendam, admirandamque hominum generi, pulchritudo mundi ordoque rerum cœleſtium cogit confiteri. Quamobrem ut religio propaganda eſt, quæ eſt juncta cum cognitione naturæ; ſic ſuperſtitionis ſtirpes omnes ejiciendæ, *de Div.* 2. 72.

[a] Reply, p. 15.

[b] Defence, p. 19.

[c] Reply to Def. p. 16.

truth; not, as you ſay, by *dropping*, but keeping ſtrictly to the merits of the queſtion: which you are forced in effect to give up, by declaring here, *that whether the Ægyptians were generally circumciſed or no, is no material inquiry* [a].

To what purpoſe have you ſpent ſo much pains in inquiring about it? And why do you employ ſome pages of *your ſecond Reply*, to prove the negative? Which you endeavour to do by the help of a freſh authority from *Joſephus*; who *in giving an account of the death of* Apion, *an* Ægyptian, *tells us, that he was forced to be circumciſed on account of a diſtemper, of which he died* [b]. Upon which you give this deciſive and declarative ſentence; *that it may ſuffice to ſhew, both that the* Ægyptians *in general did not practiſe this rite, and that* Joſephus *knew very well that they did not.* Yet this very fact, from which you decide ſo dogmatically, will be found at laſt very little to your purpoſe; and like ſome other authorities you alledge, tho' it has ſome ſhew, has no foundation. The thing aſſerted is, that *the* Ægyptians *under the flouriſhing ſtate of their antient Monarchy and Religion were generally circumciſed:* and you to confute it, oppoſe the caſe of a *ſingle Ægyptian*; which is not pretended to have happened, till after *their Monarchy* and *Religion* had been diſſolved, and the Country converted to a *Roman Province.* How judicious and concluſive ſuch reaſoning is, I ſhall leave to the reader.

But you tell me here, that *I have as ill luck as ever at quotations* [c]; becauſe I obſerve, that *Joſephus makes no other reflection on the account* Herodotus *gives, of Circumciſion's being borrowed from* Ægypt; *than that of ſuch things every one may think as he pleaſes.* This you affirm, to be *a moſt falſe repreſentation of the matter.* To which I may anſwer, that whether it be *true* or *falſe*, it is of no conſequence to any point in debate: The uſe I make of *Joſephus*, is to ſhew, that in his account of *ſcriptural facts*, he allows a *greater latitude* of interpreting and explaining them, than *modern Advocates* do; and if he really does ſo, in *facts* of greater moment and importance to *Religion* than this, as I ſhall clearly ſhew hereafter; then the uſe I make of him is certainly juſt, however I have repreſented him here: but I ſhall inſiſt upon it withall, that in this very caſe, 'tis not *my repreſentation*, but *your charge* upon me that is *falſe*. You imagine, that the reflection made here by *Joſephus*, that *of ſuch things every one may think as he pleaſes*; relates wholly to *the Story of* Shiſac's *plundering the City and Temple of* Jeruſalem; and to the queſtion, whether *Herodotus refers to the ſame event, or no:* and I allow, that the account of this ſtory, and the proof of its being mentioned by *Herodotus*, make the ſubſtance of the paragraph: and what is ſaid about *Circumciſion*, ſeems thrown in by way of confirmation of it: upon which immediately follows *the reflection* above mentioned, that cloſes the whole: which, however applicable to the other contents of the paragraph, yet cannot be interpreted ſo, as to exclude a reference to the *caſe of Circumciſion*, that immediately precedes it: nay, by all rational conſtruction muſt be thought, if not ſolely, yet principally to refer to it; becauſe as far as I have obſerved or can recollect of *Joſephus*; tho' he uſes the *ſame reflection* very often, yet he never applies it but to *ſome fact or point of great moment*, to the truth or eſſential character of the *Jewiſh Religion.* Now as *the ſtory of Shiſac* in this paragraph is of no conſequence to the *Jewiſh Nation or Religion*; ſo 'tis rational to think *the reflection*, 'tis cloſed with, applicable to the caſe of *Circumciſion*, which is of conſequence. But of this we ſhall be better able to judge, after I have explained my ſentiments on the other more important paſſages of *Joſephus.*

---

[a] Reply to Defence, p. 16. [b] Ibid. p. 18. [c] Ibid. p. 19.

I ſhall juſt touch *another of your cavils*, which you inſiſt on again in *your ſaid Reply.* I had obſerved of the *Ægyptians*, that *they were more addicted to miracles and prodigies, than all other people.* And referred myſelf for the truth of my obſervation to a paſſage of *Herodotus:* in which I *deceive my reader*, you ſay [*a*], *at the expence of a falſe quotation.* To this I anſwered; that the *word τέρατα in the original*, on which the ſenſe of the paſſage turns, *carries the*

[*b*] Reply, p. 23, 24.

notion of miracles, as well as prodigies; that a *ſuperſtitious regard to the one neceſſarily implied the ſame regard to the other*; *and that in fact, it was certain from other authorities*; *that the* Ægyptians *were juſt as much addicted to miracles as to prodigies* [a]. Now what do you ſay to all this? Do you deny any one article of it? No. Do you pretend to ſay that τέρατα does not ſignify *miracles?* No. You own it does. Do you ſhew or ſo much as hint, that *the Ægyptians* were not as much addicted *to the one* as *to the other?* No; all that you do, is to *aſſert and inſiſt* ſtill, that the word, *miracles*, is neither expreſſed nor implied in *the ſentence* [b]. For my part, in all Diſputes of this kind, 'tis my care to attend *to things*, inſtead of cavilling at *Words*; and where I allow the general purpoſe of a teſtimony to be true, am content to overlook any little inaccuracies of rendring it; for if like you, I was diſpoſed to ſquabble and fight my way thro' *every ſyllable of a quotation*, inſtead of the few you except to of mine, there is hardly a ſingle one of yours, that I could not with the ſame truth charge *with falſhood and miſrepreſentation.* Let's take for inſtance the firſt *Greek* one we find, at the bottom of your page; which you tranſlate thus: *for all the Ceremonies of the Temple, and a thouſand other precepts would be neglected, if we were to confine ourſelves onely to the Allegorical Signification* [c]. Now the word *All*, about which you make ſuch a rout in both *your Replies* [d], is neither expreſſed nor underſtood in the *original*; nor is there any word that anſwers directly to, *Ceremonies*; nor ſo much as a tittle, that ſignifies *Precepts*; and what you tranſlate, *a thouſand*, ought to be rendered *ten thouſand*; what you render, *confine ourſelves to*, ought to be rendred *attend to.* Why then may not I exclaim here with as much juſtice as you do; *what groſs miſrepreſentation is this*, where there are almoſt as many offences *againſt ſtrict Tranſlation*, as there are words? But I ſcorn to waſte my time and pains in ſuch trifling; ſhall give up all *that field of*

---

[a] Defence, p. 48.

[b] Reply to Def. p. 22.

[c] Τῆς περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἁγιστείας καὶ μυρίων ἄλλων ἀμελήσομεν, εἰ μόνοις προσέξωμεν τοῖς δι' ὑπονοιῶν δηλουμένοις. Ibid. p. 51.

[d] See Reply, p. 23. Item, Reply to Defence, p. 20.

Criticiſm to yourſelf; nor envy you the credit of Learning and Judgment that ſuch arts can procure you.

As to *your other Cavils at my Quotations*, I ſhall leave them where they ſtand to the judgment of the Reader; and if he compares what I have ſaid in defence of them, with the force of what you have objected, I need be in no pain for the judgment he will make: *the quotations* themſelves are produced to ſhew, that the *Jews had borrowed ſome of their ceremonies and cuſtoms from Ægypt:* this is the *onely point in queſtion*; and if you had *replied* to any purpoſe, or had any real concern for truth, 'twas your buſineſs to have *joined iſſue* on that; to have examined into the real ſtate of it: which after *two Replies* you have induſtriouſly declined. The Fact has been conſtantly aſſerted by men of the greateſt Learning, and the moſt converſant in both *Jewiſh* and *Ægyptian Antiquity* [a]; without any ſuſpicion that the acknowledgment of it could be of any diſſervice to *true Religion*. *Calmet*, the moſt diligent of the modern Commentators, tells us, *that as* Moſes *came out of* Ægypt, *and the people, whoſe Leader he was, had been trained in all the cuſtoms, laws and religion of that country*; *it was not poſſible for him as Legiſlator to propoſe any thing to them, but in conformity to the ideas, impreſſions and habits they were prepoſſeſſed with. That they had a ſurpriſing inclination to Idolatry, from their education in an idolatrous country, where they gave themſelves up to the eſtabliſhed Religion with pleaſure and greedineſs, as it was adapted to their genius, and agreeable to their inclination: and that we muſt attend to, and carry this notion along with us, in order to enter into the deſign and ſpirit of the Moſaic writings* [b]. Dr. *Spencer*'s famed work on this very ſubject is at this day greatly and juſtly admired in all *Chriſtian countries*; and his zeal for *Revealed Religion*, ſo little queſtioned on that account, that Archbiſhop *Teniſon* left fifty pounds by will, as a reward to *the publiſher of a new Edition* of it, with the *poſthumous additions of the Author*; which we have ſeen not long ſince executed by a learned Divine: and to declare my own opinion of the fact; I take it to be ſo clearly grounded in the *teſtimony of Hiſtory, both ſacred and profane*, that if it cannot be looked upon as *abſolutely certain*, yet it is at leaſt ſo *highly probable*; that to deny it raſhly and peremptorily, as *ſome Divines* are diſpoſed to do, will always do miſchief inſtead of ſervice to the *Chriſtian Cauſe*, by giving diſguſt and offence to candid and impartial inquirers. For *nothing*, as Biſhop *Tillotſon* wiſely obſerves [*b*], *has been more pernicious to the Chriſtian Religion, than the vain pretence of men to greater aſſurance concerning things relating to it, than they can make good; the miſchief of which is this; that when diſcerning and inquiſitive men find that men pretend to greater matters, than they can prove, this makes them doubt of all they ſay, and to call in queſtion the truth of Chriſtianity itſelf.*

---

[a] Non negaverim Moſem cum jura conderet, retinuiſſe leges aliquas Ægyptior. &c. Huet. Dem. Evangel. 88. xi.

[b] Comment. Pref. Gen. p. vi. and p. x.

'Twas this reflection, that gave riſe to this Controverſy; and the motive of publiſhing *my Letter to Dr. W.* was a perſuaſion, that he was purſuing the very method condemned by the Archbiſhop; taking *greater matters* upon himſelf *than he could prove*; dogmatizing with *greater aſſurance of* things than he could *make good:* and the intention of my addreſs to him was to ſhew him the danger of what, in my judgment, he had *raſhly* undertaken and was *raſhly* executing; and not to declare *any ſentiments of my own:* to convince him, that his *arbitrary manner* of deciding queſtions of the utmoſt nicety and difficulty; by not allowing *the leaſt colour of reaſon or probability* to any objections; but imputing them all to the *ignorance, malice and wickedneſs* of the objectors, was not the proper way to *convince*, but to *ſhock* every rational Sceptick. It was with this view I propoſed, what I have offered in *My Letter*, about *the Hiſtory of Man's fall, Circumciſion, the Confuſion of Languages, the Diſperſion of Mankind*, &c. in order to ſhew the *literal account* and ſolution of thoſe facts to be charged with difficulties, ſufficient to puzzle even the ſtrongeſt

---

[*a*] *Tillotſon*'s Works, Vol. III. p. 452.

ſtrongeſt reaſon: which, inſtead of being ſlubbered over, as trifling and inſignificant, muſt be candidly owned and calmly and freely examined, before *Religion* can be eſtabliſhed on *a firm and ſolid foundation.*

And 'tis certain at leaſt after all our endeavours, that ſome things will be found in *Scripture*, which no wit of man can account for, or reconcile to *the natural dictates of reaſon:* and which muſt be left to *the wiſdom of God* to clear up in his own good time. *Porphyry,* as St. *Jerom* ſays, *uſed to object and demand, for what reaſon a merciful God could for ſo many ages, from* Adam *to* Moſes, *and from* Moſes *to* Chriſt, *ſuffer whole Nations to periſh thro' ignorace of his will and law: and why it was neceſſary for* Chriſt *to come ſo late, and not before an innumerable multitude of men had been loſt? Which queſtion,* ſays he, *the bleſſed Apoſtle, in his Epiſtle to the* Romans, *moſt prudently handles, owning his ignorance, and referring it to the knowledge of God. Which ought to teach all others, as he ſays, the ſame modeſty of owning their ignorance too in queſtions of this ſort* [a],

But neither the *example of the Apoſtle,* nor the *admonition of the Father,* can reſtrain the *adventurous Spirit of our modern Champions* from undertaking this very queſtion; and proving, that, whatever St. *Paul* thought, there's no occaſion to own any ignorance at all; for that the fact objected is found at laſt to be falſe, and there really was *no period of time,* in which the Nations of the World wanted light and opportuniy of knowing the *Revealed Will and ſtanding Law of God* [b].

But to reſume what I was ſaying, of the *Hiſtory of Man's Fall, the Confuſion of Languages*; *and the Diſperſion of Mankind:* As the firſt is a point of great moment, I ſhall take occaſion to explain myſelf fully upon it by and by: in order to which, I ſhall here diſmiſs the *two laſt*, by deſiring the Reader onely to recollect *the Obſervation* made above; that I was not *declaring* here any *Sentiments* of my own, but ſhewing onely the inſufficiency of what was advanced by Dr. *W.* And if on this, or any other occaſion, I have uſed a *greater freedom or levity of expreſſion,* than is thought decent on *queſtions of ſuch importance*; I hope it may be ſome excuſe for me, that I was writing as *a perſon concealed:* a circumſtance, that naturally diſpoſes to more freedom, than a Man would otherwiſe take; eſpecially when he hopes by that very means the more effectually to diſguiſe his real character; as well as to raiſe an attention to what he has to offer by *ſome ſting and ſpirit* in the manner of offering it. Dr. *W.* greatly contemns *his Antagoniſt*, for being *dull, inſipid and without poignancy* [a]: ſo that it was neceſſary for me to addreſs him in a *different ſtile*; that if I did not happen to pleaſe, I might at leaſt have the fortune to eſcape his contempt. With this reflection let the reader review what I have ſaid on the *ſtory of* Babel; and he will ſee, that I have paſſed *no peremptory judgment* upon it; declared no other opinion but this; that *the origin of languages may, with ſome colour of reaſon and probability, be accounted for in a natural way.*

---

[a] Quam quæſtionem beatus Apoſtolus ad Romanos ſcribens, prudentiſſime ventilat, ignorans hæc, & Dei concedens ſcientiæ. Dignare & tu iſta neſcire quæ quæris. Concede Deo potentiam ſui, nequaquam te indiget defenſore, *Hier. ad Cteſiph. adv. Pelag. Op. T.* IV. *Par.* II. *p.* 481. *Edit. Bened.*

[b] *See* Scripture Vindicated. Par. II. Poſtſcript.

As for *the Diſperſion of Mankind*, I am very certain, that *Dr.* W.*'s account and your defence* of it will appear *abſurd and irrational* to every judicious reader: and as I do not find *in Scripture*, that there was *any miracle or extraordinary interpoſition of God* employed to effect it; ſo I think myſelf at *liberty* to ſolve and explain it in any manner agreeable to *reaſon:* what I have propoſed to that purpoſe, is, in my judgment, a cauſe fully adequate to the end, and what could not fail to bring it about, as ſoon as there was occaſion, from the *very nature and neceſſities of human kind.*

I ſhall now proceed to give ſome account of the uſe I make of *Joſephus*'s Authority; as well as to conſider the force of your objections on this head.

---

[a] Scripture Vindicated. Par. II. p. 36.

In the firſt place then, you allow *Joſephus* to have been a *wiſe and excellent Apologiſt of the Jewiſh Religion and Government*, and *a true lover of both*; and ſuggeſt ſeveral reaſons, why it would not have been *prudent in him, to have inſiſted ſtrongly on* Moſes's *Miracles, or the Divine Authority of the Jewiſh Religion*; that *he knew he was treading on dangerous ground*; *and that 'twas his buſineſs to guard againſt giving offence to the prejudiced Heathens*; *that in many parts of his Antiquities, where he relates a Miracle, he leaves his readers to think of it, as they pleaſe, without exacting from them a full belief of it: and in ſhort, that in his Book againſt* Apion, *he wholly omits the mention of* Moſes's *Miracles* [*a*.]

Now this, Sir, is owning much more, than is neceſſary to juſtify the *full uſe* I endeavour to draw from him: that as he, *whoſe ſincerity in his Religion* is confeſſed, and *whoſe prudence in the defence of it* applauded, allowed *a liberty of thinking*, and *a latitude of explaining* ſome *ſcriptural facts* of great moment; ſo our *modern Advocates* ought to temper *their zeal* with the *ſame prudence*, by leaving likewiſe *ſome liberty* in the explication of the *ſame facts*. And your own account proves my inference to be not onely juſt, but temperate too: for I do not contend for *all the liberty* which *Joſephus* has given; but where he has given *ſo much*, that *our Apologiſts* might reaſonably indulge *ſome*.

Joſephus's deſign in his *Book againſt Apion* was, by your own account of it, exactly the ſame with Dr. *W*.'s in his *Book againſt Chriſtianity as old*, &c. that is, *to confute* [*b*] *the particular objections and calumnies of Infidels and prejudiced perſons, who repreſent* Moſes *as an Impoſtor, and his laws as making men worſe inſtead of better*. Now if *Joſephus* acted wiſely in *not preſſing*, as you ſay, *too forwardly the Miracles and Divine Authority of* Moſes; *but endeavouring by a prudent and detxrous way of treating thoſe points to ſoften and win the Infidels to his ſide*: then 'tis reaſonable to infer, that Dr. *W*. not onely might, but ought to have followed

---

[*a*] Reply to Defence, p. 66, &c.

[*b*] Ibid. p. 67.

his example, in points at leaſt of leſs moment: and ſuch a conduct muſt have been eſteemed in the Doctor, what you declare it to have been in *Joſephus*; the effect of a *ſincere zeal and love for his Religion.*

You tell us very gravely, that *Joſephus had no view either in his Book of Antiquities, or That againſt* Apion *to make converts to Judaiſm*; *but onely to give the* Greeks *and* Romans *a favourable opinion of the* Jewiſh *Nation* [*a*]. But does not an elaborate Attempt *to recommend his Religion* as effectually as he can, and to turn *the prejudices* conceived againſt it into *a favourable opinion of* it, neceſſarily imply a deſign *of making converts?* If not, I am at a loſs to know what other way there is of making any. The *Biſhop of* Meaux'*s famed Piece*, in which he dreſſes up ſo *moderate and qualified a Picture of Popery*, as to offend *the Zealots* even of his own Religion, was not written, you may ſay, with *any view to make converts*; but to give the Proteſtants onely, *a favourable opinion of the Popiſh Religion*, and *take off their prejudices againſt it:* but would not people be apt to laugh at you for ſaying ſo? The caſe is much the ſame in what you ſay of *Joſephus.*

Your next obſervation is more trifling: that *it would not have been ſafe for him to have acted otherwiſe*; that *his life was at the mercy of the Heathens*; and *to have preſſed the Divine Authority of his Religion more ſtrongly, would have been looked on as an open diſparagement of the* Roman *Religion and Laws too.* And what *he ſays therefore of* Minos *was for fear of offending thoſe, who had received his laws as given from Heaven* [*b*]. But was there then in *Old Rome*, as there is in the *New*, an *Inquiſition* eſtabliſhed for the ſecurity of *the Publick Religion?* Or what zeal could *a* Roman *Emperor* have for the *laws of* Minos, made ſo many ages before, for *the little Iſland of* Crete; which by that time, we may ſuppoſe, had been long antiquated? No, Sir, all this reaſoning of yours has no foundation in truth or hiſtory; 'tis merely talking at random, and deſerves no other anſwer, than that of ridicule.

[*a*] Reply to Defence, p. 65.

[*b*] Reply to Defence, p. 66, 72.

As to the *Book of Jewiſh Antiquities*, the fact is; that *Joſephus*, in order to take off *the prejudice and averſion*, which the World had generally conceived to *the Jews*, and to give the beſt impreſſion he was able of their *Religion and Polity*, undertakes to draw out a *perpetual Hiſtory* of both, from *the Records of the Old Teſtament*, in a language at that time the moſt univerſally known and practiſed of any other: declaring, that his intention was not *to vary a tittle from what he found in the Sacred Books*; and *that he was to be conſidered onely as a mere Interpreter of them* [a]. Now in the execution of this work you obſerve, that *Joſephus expreſſes himſelf very plainly in many paſſages, on the Article of* Moſes's *Inſpiration and the divine origin of the Law* [b]. And reaſon good, that he ſhould do ſo; where he profeſſes to ſpeak nothing but what the *Scriptures plainly dictate*: ſo that, as oft as *the Scriptures* have occaſion to mention *the Inſpiration of* Moſes, ſo oft was he obliged to mention it too, from the very nature of the taſk he had undertaken: and in all ſuch places we can collect nothing certain of *Joſephus*'s *real opinion*, but of the *ſenſe of Scripture* onely; which he had obliged himſelf to follow. But whenever he *varies* from *that Scripture*; as he does remarkably in many caſes; *contrary to his own declaration*; and without any other reaſon than what depended on his own choice; and where in the relation of any fact, he gives *a different turn* to it, from what we find in the *Moſaick account*, 'tis there, we are to look for the *Sentiments and Principles of* Joſephus.

Now all men of learning obſerve, that *his Hiſtory* is in many particulars *very different from that of* Moſes; that *he adds ſome things* of his own; *wholly omits* others; and interprets moſt of them ſo, as to give them the eaſier credit *with the Heathens*; and this eſpecially, in the *article of Miracles*. *Fabricius* has collected the cenſures of learned men upon him on this very account [c]: and *Peter Brinch*, a *learned Divine* and *critical reader* of him, has given us his own; where he tells us, *that it was a fault not uncommon with him, to relate the Miracles from Sacred Writ in ſuch a manner, as to make them even doubtful and ſuſpected* [a]. For inſtance; where he gives an account of the *wonderful appearance of God on Mount* Sinai, he interpoſes this reflection very uſual with him; *of theſe things the reader may think as he pleaſes; 'tis neceſſary for me to relate them, juſt as they are written in the Sacred Books* [b]. To the ſtory of *Nebuchadnezzar*, he ſubjoins the ſame reflection *let no man blame me for delivering theſe particulars, as I found them in the old Books: for in the beginning of my Hiſtory I declared, that I acted onely the part of a Tranſlator*, &c [c]. And in the next Chapter, after an account of *Daniel and his Prophecies*, he concludes the Book by ſaying; *for my part, as I have found and read theſe things, ſo I have written them; but if any man be diſpoſed to think differently about them, he ſhall not be blamed by me for his different way of thinking* [d]. Laſtly, in the account of the Prophet *Jonah*, excuſing himſelf, as it were, for delivering a ſtory ſo ſtrange, he *twice* puts the reader in mind *that he writes onely what he takes from the Scripture* [e].

---

[a] Procem. in Lib. I. Antiq. & Lib. X. c. x. §. 6.

[b] Reply to Defence, p. 65.

[c] Vid. Fabricii Biblioth, Gr. l. 4. c. 6. it. Havercamp. Edit. Joſeph. Vol. 2. Append. p. 57.

'Tis to no purpoſe to collect any more inſtances of this kind, or *the variations he* has made from *Moſes*, or the *natural cauſes* hinted in the caſe of *ſome miracles*; or *his omiſſions* of ſome remarkable facts, as of the *Golden Calf*, the *Brazen Serpent*, &c. all ſuppoſed to be done with the ſame view of recommending his *Religion* to Strangers. The uſe I make of this is, to ſhew the truth of what I had gathered from *this very Book of Antiquities, that his real Sentiments of the Divine Authority of Moſes* were not carried to *that height*, to which *our Divines* commonly puſh theirs: and this you modeſtly call, *the raſhneſs of my aſſertion, or the negligence of my*

---

[a] Nec rarum Joſepho iſtud vitium eſt, quod divina ex ſacris literis miracula ita referat, ut dum refert, dubia lectoribus & ſuſpecta reddat, &c. Edit. Havercamp. *ibid.* p. 301.

[b] Antiq. I. III. c. v. §. 2.

[c] Ibid. l. X. c. x. §. 6.

[d] Antiq. c. xi. ad. fin.

[e] Ibid. c. x. §, 2.

reading [a]; though all men of learning allow it; even thoſe, who allow at the ſame time, as you do, that *Joſephus was ſincere and zealous in his Religion.* And if, *zealous* as he was, he took a *liberty* himſelf, and indulged it to others, of ſolving by different ways the great events recorded in *Scripture*; a conduct, which you, in effect, declare to be *wiſe and prudent*; it follows of courſe, that *the inference*, I made, is reaſonable, and what I muſt inſiſt upon again; that our *zealous Advocates of Chriſtianity*, ought for the ſame reaſons, of *not giving offence to Infidels*, and *hurting the cauſe they would vindicate*, to follow his example at leaſt ſo far as to uſe *ſome degree of temper and moderation*, where he is juſtly thought to have uſed *too much* of it.

From this general view of *Joſephus*'s *Writings*, I come once more to conſider *the particular paſſage* in diſpute between us taken from his *Book againſt* Apion [b]: which you call my *Maſter-piece of Quotation.* I had before obſerved that the diſpute turned wholly on a *point of fact*, about what *Joſephus had or had not ſaid* in this place; and that I was not declaring *any opinion of my own*, but examining onely *into that fact.* But as this caution has not proved ſufficient to guard me from *envy and clamour*, ſo I muſt again beg the reader to attend more diſtinctly to the *true ſtate of the Queſtion*, and not to charge on me the Sentiments, which the nature of the Controverſy leads me to charge on *Joſephus.*

Now after a due examination of what you have offered in *your ſecond Reply* to my expoſition of the paſſage before us; I find myſelf obliged to perſiſt ſtill in what I had before declared; that we cannot by any fair and rational conſtruction draw out of this paragraph *any notion of the Divine Miſſion and Inſpiration of* Moſes, in that high ſenſe of it in which 'tis commonly received, without the help of that *prejudice and prevention*, we come poſſeſſed with, in favour of the notion we ſearch for. You tell us yourſelf, that *in this Book againſt* Apion *the invention of* Moſes's *miracles is intirely*

---

[a] Reply to Def. p. 75.

[b] Contr. Ap. lib. II. c. 16.

omitted [a]: and does not this conceſſion prepare us for the very interpretation I give? To confirm which, we are to conſider the *general tenor and ſcope* of the paragraph; to connect one part with another ſo, as to make them ſeverally conſiſtent with the obvious ſenſe of the whole: and not to dwell, as you do, on the rigorous meaning of *two or three* words, which cannot be admitted, without controuling and over-ruling the clear ſenſe of *an hundred.* But ſince much more has already been ſaid on this paſſage, than the merit of it will juſtify; I ſhall take notice onely of *one of the difficulties* you charge in *your ſecond Reply*; ſince the clearing up of this will be deciſive and effectual to the confutation of all the reſt.

The difficulty I mean relates to the laſt ſentence in the paragraph, which I have tranſlated thus. *Some have thrown the form of their publick affairs into a Monarchy; others into the power of a few, or an Oligarchy: others into the multitude, or a Democracy: but our Lawgiver had no regard to any of theſe, but if a man may uſe an expreſſion ſo forced, made the form of Government he inſtituted, a Theocracy* [b]. Where the *laſt words*, I ſay, *clinch the whole* to the ſenſe I had been eſtabliſhing. But you object here, that I have *falſly and abſurdly* tranſlated the words, θεοκρατίαν ἀπέδειξε, *he made his Government, a Theocracy: whereas, it plainly ſignifies, what the Old* Latin *Interpreter gave*; *he declared it to be ſo*; *he propoſed, and delivered it, as a Theocracy* [c]. And *when the Words*, you ſay, *are thus rightly rendered, they are very far from clinching the whole*, or confirming my explication. Here then we join iſſue; if my tranſlation be true, you will own it to *clinch the whole* to my ſenſe; if yours appear to be ſo, I will retract and recall mine. *The iſſue is ſhort*; let's proceed to the trial of it.

And as in all queſtions of this kind, the firſt inquiry ought to be about the turn and meaning of the whole connected ſentence; ſo we will firſt conſider here, to what ſenſe of the word, ἀπέδειξε,

---

[a] Reply to Defence, p. 67, 68.

[b] Defence, p. 29. See the whole paſſage.

[c] Reply to Defence, p. 69, 70.

the context directs us. *Joſephus* is giving a ſhort hint of the form of the *Jewiſh Government*, in the inſtitution of which he tells us, *that the Lawgiver had no regard to any of the different kinds ſubſiſting in the World, whether Monarchy, Oligarchy, or Democracy:* now theſe words, you will own, are applicable to *Moſes, acting authoritatively in his own proper perſon:* but they are not onely impertinent, but abſurd, if what immediately follows is not to be applied ſo too: they lead us to imagine, that he was projecting *a form of Government*, and looking abroad into the world to conſider *the various kinds of it* among other people; and that he reſolved at laſt to take his pattern from none of them, but to make his own of a different kind from them all. For what could *Joſephus* mean by telling us, that *Moſes had no regard to any other form*; if he meant in the next words to tell us, that he had *no hand in the making even his own form?* 'Tis nothing at all to the purpoſe what he had *regarded* or *not regarded*, had it not been with a view to the *making of a Government:* and thus the context is not onely impertinent, but inconſiſtent with itſelf, if your ſenſe be admitted.

As to the word itſelf, ἀπόδειξαι, I may ſafely appeal to all, who have a competent knowledge of *Greek*, whether in this place, and form of conſtruction it ought not to be rendered to the ſenſe I have given it; of *making, conſtituting, appointing:* and though it may have likewiſe, that of *declaring* or *propoſing*; yet it muſt be of ſomething *formed* and *conſtituted* by him who *declares* and *propoſes* it; and includes therefore at the ſame time *the notion of making.* Many examples of this may be found in the *Claſſic Authors*, though 'tis not eaſy to recur to them, as ſoon as they are wanted. One I have recollected from *Joſephus* himſelf, in *Jethro*'s *advice to Moſes*; about placing *Judges or Rulers* over the people. The words are ἄρχοντας ἀποδείξεις, thou ſhalt *make or conſtitute Rulers:* and a little lower, he uſes a different word of the ſame force, τάξεις, thou ſhalt *appoint* or *place over them* [a]. I have met with another in *Plutarch*, who ſpeaking of *Lycurgus*, in the very caſe of *moulding his Government*, tells us, how by *a method learnt in* Ægypt, *he made it at laſt truly elegant and perfect.* Ἀστεῖον ὡς ἀληθῶς τὸ πολίτευμα, καὶ καθαρὸν, ἀποδεῖξαι [a]. *Hen Stephens*'s *Theſaurus* furniſhes ſeveral inſtances from *Plato*, *Xenophon*, &c. where he renders the word, by *facio*, *efficio*, *reddo*, *creo*, *conſtituo:* that is, to *make*, *effect*, *create*, *conſtitute.* I ſhall juſt mention one, where *Xenophon* ſpeaking of the proper choice of Maſters for the Youth, ſays, that *ſuch of the older ſort uſed to be choſen*, *who were the moſt likely to make their children the beſt men:* τοὺς παῖδας βελτίστους ἂν ἀποδεικνῦναι [b]. And a little after, for the ſame thing, he uſes, βελτίστους παρέχειν.

---

[a] Antiq. l. 3, 4.

But you tell us withal, that the *old Interpreter* had rendered this place, by *declared his Government a Theocracy:* an *Authority*, I doubt, that will add very little weight to your cauſe; *Scaliger* declares *your old Interpreter* to have been a *great blunderer* [c]. And for what reaſon have *the Critics* diſcarded him, but that they found him to be ſo; and his verſion here contrary to ſenſe, and contrived onely to ſerve an *Hypotheſis*; which however true, cannot derive any additional credit from a *falſe tranſlation?* Have not *Hudſon* and *Havercamp*, the *learned Editors of Joſephus*, tranſlated the word, as I have given it? And did they not underſtand *Greek*, and the *Author* they have publiſhed? You muſt *reply* diſtinctly to all this, before you can make any impreſſion in favour of what you advance. You muſt ſhew *the context* to give no colour to my expoſition: you muſt ſhew *the word itſelf* to bear no ſuch meaning: you muſt ſhew that men of the firſt name in learning not to have underſtood *Greek:* and when you have done this, you may then claim the credit of reſtoring your *old Interpreter* to his *old Honours.* In the mean while, ſhould the reader allow my tranſlation to be juſt, he muſt allow withal, what you ſeem to do too, that it *clinches the whole paragraph to the ſenſe* I have given of it.

[a] Plut. in Vitâ. Lycurg. p. 41.

[b] Inſtitut. Cyri. l. 1.

[c] Præf. Hudſ. Edit. Joſeph.

I ſhall now follow you through the examination of what you call *the moſt important part of my Defence*; in which you charge me with *attempting more openly to weaken the authority of* Moſes [a]: where after you have collected into one view, what you call my *ſcattered Sentiments*, you draw up the ſtate of the controverſy into *two points* [b]. 1. *Whether* Moſes's *account of the Creation and Fall of Man is to be underſtood literally or not.* 2. *Whether the Religion and Laws which* Moſes *delivered to the* Jews *had a divine Origin and Authority.* To theſe two points I ſhall anſwer diſtinctly; and to ſhew how ready I am to humour you, as far as I am able, will give what you require, *a full and explicit account of my thoughts* upon them.

But in order to clear my way to them, it will be neceſſary to conſider what you have objected, as uſual, to *two quotations* of mine that relate to the ſame ſubject.

In ſupport of my expoſition of *the paragraph*, we have been examining, and to ſhew, that *Joſephus had put* Moſes *on the ſame foot with* Minos *and the other old Lawgivers*; I took occaſion to obſerve, that this was ſo far from *weakening* Moſes's *authority*, that it tended to *ſtrengthen it* with thoſe, to whom it was addreſſed; who had the higheſt eſteem and opinion of *thoſe very Lawgivers*, and were ſo far from being ſcandalized at the *fictions* contrived by them for *the good of the people*; that they *bragged* of them the more for that very reaſon, as the *greateſt benefactors of mankind*. This I confirmed from *Diodorus Siculus*, *Plutarch*, *Plato*. But *to theſe*, you ſay [c] *'tis not worth while to anſwer*; *they are Heathen authorities, and I am welcome to them:* and as much *Heathens* as they are, they are *welcome*, I aſſure you, to me: I am proud of their acquaintance; and though I do not intend to die in their faith, yet reſolve to live in their friendſhip.

Of theſe *Plato* particularly, who has written *on Government* more fully than any of the Antients, affirms it to be the *chief duty of a Magiſtrate, to contrive ſuch Fables, Fictions or Political Lies,* as he thinks the moſt effectual to inſtil into the people *a reverence for the Laws,* and diſpoſe them to a *willing obedience* to them. Now the *Greek* Fathers, I obſerved, were poſſeſſed likewiſe with a common opinion, that *Plato* had diligently ſtudied the *Books of Moſes,* and copied ſo many of his notions from them, that he was called by ſome the *Attick Moſes:* and that *Clemens of Alexandria* and *Euſebius* do in a manner aſſert, or *ſay at leaſt much the ſame thing,* that *Plato*'s *notion of the uſe of thoſe Fables and Fictions was borrowed from the Moſaic Writings* [a]. But here you tell me flatly, that *I have miſrepreſented* Clemens, *and acted ſtill more unfairly with* Euſebius [b], whom ſince I have treated, it ſeems, *the worſt of the two,* I will endeavour to do juſtice to in the firſt place.

---

[a] Reply to Defence, p. 46. [b] Ibid. p. 48. [c] Ibid. p. 61.

And on a review of the paſſage taken from him, I find myſelf ſo far from having treated him *unfairly,* that I have aſcribed nothing to him but what his very words plainly and directly expreſs. In the *eleventh Book of his Preparation,* he ſets out by undertaking to ſhew, *the exact agreement of the* Greeks, *and above all of* Plato, *with the Books of* Moſes, *in all the moſt important points.* And the ſubject of the Book is to prove this by a compariſon of the particulars. He opens the *twelfth Book* by telling us, that the purpoſe of it is to ſhew, *the particular agreement of* Plato *with the Jewiſh Oracles, juſt like the harmony of a well-tuned Lyre, in all the articles not ſpecified in the former Book.* And in each Chapter of this Book, in which there are fifty, he gives a different example of this ſame *harmony;* prefixing to each *a Summary or Title* of the contents it treats of. Among which we find theſe that follow.

That *Children ought to be trained up by Fables.*

That *a careful choice ought to be made of ſuch Fables.*

That *we ought not to expoſe to all promiſcuouſly the profound and awful doctrines of Truth.*

That Plato *allegorizes the ſtory of Paradiſe, juſt as* Moſes.

That *Youth ſhould be trained to the exerciſe of Virtue by Hymns and Songs.*

---

[a] Defence, p. 44.

[b] Reply to Def. p. 62, 64.

That *'tis neceſſary ſometimes to uſe a Lye inſtead of Phyſick, for the good of thoſe who want it.*

The paſſage I have quoted is found under this *laſt title*; and the Chapter itſelf begins with *the words of* Plato, to this effect, as nearly as I can render them: That *a Lawgiver, who is good for any thing, ought above all other Fictions contrived for the good of the Youth, to invent ſuch eſpecially, as tend to make them do what is right and juſt, not by force, but readily and willingly.* To which is immediately ſubjoined the reflection of *Euſebius himſelf, that there are very many inſtances of this kind, in the books of the* Hebrews.

I appeal now to every reader, whether 'tis poſſible for a teſtimony to be more *explicit and direct* than this. 'Tis produced to prove, that according to *Euſebius*, Plato*'s notion of Political Fictions was borrowed from* Moſes. *Euſebius* expreſly affirms it. How is it then that I have acted *unfairly* with him? Becauſe I conceal, it ſeems, and drop the following words, which ſhew, that the *Fiction* he imputes to *Scripture*, conſiſted onely in aſcribing *human paſſions to the Deity*, and repreſenting him, as *jealous, ſleepy, angry*; which, however it may amuſe ſome readers, is yet nothing at all to the purpoſe. The fact, for which *Euſebius* is appealed to, is, whether Plato *borrowed the notion from Scripture*, or no: Euſebius *declares that he did*; which is all that I am concerned for. If we would know the particular inſtances of *Fiction* that *Plato* borrowed; we muſt learn that from *Plato himſelf*, and not from *Euſebius*. I have ſhewn what kind it was that *Plato* recommended; and no body, I dare ſay, can ſhew that he ever recommended what *Euſebius* here mentions; or for *the good of the People* ever feigned God to be *jealous, angry, ſleepy*, &c. My buſineſs then being to prove the authority of *Euſebius*, that Plato *had borrowed his notion from* Moſes; it could not be to the purpoſe to exemplify it, by inſtances, which he did not borrow. And *Euſebius* might poſſibly give this turn to his argument, to obviate *the offence*, which a frank allowance of ſuch a fact might give to the more *rigid and zealous*: it being well known, that no ſmall clamour was raiſed againſt him by the *ſtrictly orthodox* of thoſe times, for his *opinions* in ſome high Points of Religion.

Let's now ſee what you object to the other paſſage of *Clemens*; who in ſpeaking, as I ſay, of the *Art of governing*, *allows the* Greeks *to have learnt from* Moſes *among other leſſons of Policy, the proper uſe and application of Lying or Fiction* [a]. But you charge me here with *miſrepreſentation*, in calling that the *Art of governing*, which ought to be rendered the *Art of governing in war*, or *the Art of a General.* And ſhould I grant you this, pray what would you gain by it? Does it not come up to what I contend for; or at leaſt, as I have put it, *to much the ſame thing?* For what difference is there in the thing itſelf, when uſed for the *good of the people*, whether it be uſed *in peace*, or *in war?* Unleſs that *in war*, 'tis ſeldom practiſed with effect, but *to the deſtruction of thouſands*; *in peace* without the *leaſt hurt or injury* to any one: and this difference, I'm afraid, will give no advantage to your ſide of the queſtion.

Dolus an virtus quis in hoſte requirit:

is, I know, the ordinary maxim of *military policy*; and you give us from *Virgil*, the *mentita tela* of an enemy: but you forget what you had obſerved on a leſs pertinent occaſion, that theſe are *Heatheniſh maxims*; the ſuggeſtions of a *looſe morality*: Will you undertake to defend them by the *ſtrict principles of Religion*, or aſſert the practice of them to be honourable in *the character of* Moſes? If you can do this, then *the uſe of Fiction* in any caſe for *the good of the people* may ſurely be defended by the ſame principles. For to conſider Moſes's *character:* was he *not divinely inſpired and aſſiſted* in the ſame extraordinary manner in all *the Events of war*, as in all *the Arts of peace?* by *ſtretching out his rod* he could drown a mighty hoſt; by *lifting up his hands deſtroy* a whole army: is it not then the ſame diminution of his *divine Authority*, to ſuppoſe him under a neceſſity of recurring to *Fiction* or *Stratagem* in the one caſe, as in the other? Conſidering, I ſay, the circumſtances of Moſes's *character*, it ſeems difficult to make out the difference: yet you roundly aſſert, and think the aſſertion innocent, that he might uſe *all the arts of deceiving in war*; but will not ſuffer me to impute to him the *leaſt poſſible degree of it in peace*, without *weakening his Authority*.

---

[a] Defence, p. 44.

But as this paſſage of *my Defence* has generally been thought the moſt exceptionable of any in *my Two Pieces*; ſo I muſt beg leave to recite here my very words, in order to explain my true meaning in them the more clearly; they run thus: *Is the notion then of the Divine Origin of the Law, and the Inſpiration of* Moſes *to be reſolved into Fiction and Fable, or political Lying? No, far be it from me to think or ſay that: but this perhaps one may venture to ſay; that the ſuppoſition of ſome degree of ſuch Fiction may poſſibly be found neceſſary to the ſolving the difficulties of the* Moſaic *Writings, without any hurt to their authority, or advantage to Infidelity* &c [a]. And here we ſee after all the cry that has been made againſt me, I expreſly diſclaim the *leaſt thought* of ſaying or doing any thing, that really contradicts the *Divine Origin of the Law or Inſpiration of* Moſes: and in the next words, where I ſeem to allow *ſome degree of Fiction*, I have uſed all the terms of *reſerve, doubt and diffidence*, that can poſſibly be crouded into any ſentence: *perhaps*; *may venture*; *ſome degree*; *may poſſibly be found*: which can by no means imply a perſuaſion, but an hint onely to ground a queſtion upon. And that ſtill, upon a ſuppoſition, that ſuch a queſtion can do *no manner of hurt to the authority of* Moſes, or *ſervice to Infidelity*. When the reader has duly reflected on this, then let him conſider, how juſtly I have been accuſed from the evidence of this paſſage, of calling in queſtion *the Divine Inſpiration of the Scriptures*.

To return to the teſtimony of *Clemens*: where tho' it ſeems needleſs to ſay any thing more of a *tranſlation*, which bears equally in either ſenſe to the point in queſtion; yet as I never tranſlated any paſſage with deſign to make it bear more than it would ſtrictly carry; ſo I think myſelf obliged to give ſome account here, why I tranſlated the word ϛρατήγημα, by the *Art of governing in general*, and not, as you would have it, the *Art of governing in war:* and for this I had the following reaſons.

---

[a] Defence, p. 45.

That tho' I well knew the word, ϛρατηγεῖν, to ſignify properly, *to lead an army* or *govern it in war*, in the *old Claſſick Authors*, yet I knew withal, that in the time of *Joſephus*, and of the *Eccleſiaſtical Writers* eſpecially, who lived after him, the word had loſt its *proper*, *original* ſenſe, and was applicable to denote *Civil Magiſtracy* or *Government in general*. Thus *Moſes* is commonly called by *Joſephus* the ϛρατηγὸς *of the Jews*, not in the notion of a *General* or *Leader of an army*, but of *ſupreme Governor* or *Magiſtrate*. And this, as in many other places, ſo in that particularly, where he appears in the meer form of a *Civil Magiſtrate*, and in the very act of *hearing and judging civil cauſes* [*a*]. His ſucceſſor *Joſhua* is in like manner always ſtiled the στρατηγὸς, in the ſenſe of *general Governor* [*b*]. And what's moſt to the point, *Joſeph*, in his *government of* Ægypt, where he had no *military command*, is called in the ſame ſenſe, στρατηγὸς: where a *learned Critick* in a marginal note obſerves, that *this word had in that Age loſt its relation to War, and denoted Civil Power or Government in general* [*c*]. In which ſenſe the *Eccleſiaſtical Writers* generally uſe it, as *Valeſius* has fully ſhewn [*d*]; and as every body will find from the old *Lexicons* and *Gloſſaries* [*e*].

This being then the common acceptation of the word in the Age of *Clemens*, an admirer of *Joſephus*; and στρατηγὸς carrying the notion of a *general Governor* or *Magiſtrate*; 'tis certain that στρατήγημα, conſidered ſingly, may truly and properly be rendered by the *Art of governing*, without any reſpect to *war*. And as the context in this place ſeemed ſomewhat perplexed and obſcure; ſo I was not curious to conſider, whether it ought to be rendered the *Art of Government*, *Civil or Military*, ſince it was obvious to reflect, as I have obſerved above, that in either ſenſe it comes to *much the ſame thing.*

[*a*] Antiq. l. 3. 4. Item, l. 4. 4. §. 7, &c.

[*b*] Ib. l. 5. 1. §. 1, 3, 29.

[*c*] Ibid. l. 2. 6.

[*d*] Valeſ. Not. ad lib. 31. Ammiani Marcell. c. vi. it. Not. ad Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. l. 7. c. xi. not. 6. it. ad Euſeb. l. 8. c. xi. not. 4.

[*e*] Du Freſne. it. Lexic. Vet. ad finem Operum S. Cyrilli. H. Steph. Theſ.

As to the fact itſelf, whether *Plato did really borrow any thing from* Moſes *or not*, I am no way concerned for the truth of it; but ſhall leave it to *theſe Fathers* to anſwer for it: what they have delivered concerning it, might be with a view to recommend their Religion *to the Greeks*, agreeably to what *Clemens* himſelf declares, that *as the Apoſtle became a* Hebrew *to the* Hebrews, *ſo it was reaſonable to become a* Greek *to* Greeks. And the very paſſage we have been examining may, for any thing I know, be one of thoſe *unſound ones*, which *Photius* tells us are to be found in this very work of *Clemens* [*a*].

I ſhall now at laſt explain myſelf more particularly on the two moſt important points of this Controverſy;

1. *The Allegorical Expoſition of the Hiſtory of the Creation and Fall of Man.*
2. *The Divine Origin and Inſpiration of the Scriptures.*

As to the firſt of theſe, you charge me with aſſerting, that *the literal ſenſe is in fact contradictory to reaſon and the notions we have of God* [*b*]. But here, Sir, you either miſtake my meaning thro' want of attention, or thro' deſign miſrepreſent it. I had ſaid in *my Letter*, that *all Commentators are forced in ſome meaſure to deſert the literal meaning* [*c*]*:* and in *my Defence*, where I have further explained myſelf, that *if it be found in fact contradictory to reaſon and the notions we have of God*, we muſt neceſſarily *deſert* it [*d*]. *The firſt* I ſhall ſtill aſſert to be true; and *the latter* all Divines whatſoever will allow to be ſo. But to reject the *literal ſenſe conditionally*, and on ſuppoſition onely of *its being contrary to reaſon*, which is all that I have done, or deſigned at leaſt to do, is a quite different thing, from what you charge me with; *the aſſerting it to be in fact contradictory to reaſon.*

[*a*] Photii Biblioth. p. 288.

[*b*] Reply to Defence, p. 48.

[*c*] Letter, p. 13.

[*d*] Def. p. 15.

So that the very foundation you build upon, of my having *abſolutely rejected the letter*, is falſe, ſince I reject it onely *hypothetically* or *conditionally*. Beſides by *deſerting the Letter*, there's no neceſſity to underſtand an *abſolute denial or rejection of all hiſtorical ſenſe* in it; but a preference onely of the *Allegorical* in ſome particular caſes, as the propereſt baſis for *a rational Defence of Religion.*

Now in this very *Hiſtory of the Creation*, I find the *Commentators* greatly divided and diſagreeing among themſelves, in their ſeveral methods of explaining it. Some prefer the *Allegorical Senſe*, others the *Literal*; moſt indeed allow, that *both* are conſiſtent, and may be uſed together: but all take a liberty of applying each arbitrarily, without any certain rule, juſt as their ſeveral ſyſtems or fancies incline them [*a*]. So that 'tis not poſſible to draw from them all, any uniform and certain principle of true belief and interpretation. 'Tis this I refer to, this I complain of in the *Defence of my Letter* [*b*] : that thoſe who defend Religion ſo *dogmatically*, do not ſtate and define what it is, *that we Chriſtians are obliged to believe* of this ſtory: that they do not determine *the bounds of Letter and Allegory*; do not fix ſome *ſettled rule* of applying them; but *jump*, as I ſay, *arbitrarily from one to the other*, as each man's whim directs him. And in this uncertainty and latitude of interpretation, 'tis ridiculous to charge particular opinions with *Infidelity*, that offend againſt no eſtabliſhed maxim or rule of expoſition.

After trifling a while about the word, *Myſtery*, in a manner that deſerves no anſwer, you collect the ſubſtance of your charge into one point, *viz.* that I alledge *in favour of Allegory that the Primitive Fathers eſteemed it on many occaſions the onely method of vindicating Scripture* [*c*]. This you treat as a *bold and raſh* Aſſertion, and exert all your Strength and Learning to prove it ſo; declaring, that I *have miſtaken the ſenſe of every one of the teſtimonies* produced to confirm it. Here then we will once more *join iſſue*, and examine the truth of your allegation and mine: where the Reader, I dare ſay, will not be ſo much ſurprized at *my boldneſs* in affirming, as at yours, in ſo *raſhly denying*, a fact, which is evident and known to all, who are converſant in *Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity*.

[*a*] Les ecrits des Peres & de la plupart des Interpretes en ſont pleins; & ces ſortes d'explications ſont ſouvent arbitraires. Calmet, Comment. Pref. Gen. p. 11.

[*b*] Defence, p. 13.

[*c*] Reply to Defence, p. 51.

As for *Origen*; in the remains ſtill left us of his Works, we have proof enough of his attachment to the *allegorical Expoſition*, and contempt of the *literal*. St. *Jerom*, ſpeaking of him declares, *that he turned the ſtory of Paradiſe ſo wholly to Allegory, as to deſtroy or take away all the literal truth of it: by the Trees, underſtanding Angels; by the Rivers, Cœleſtial Virtues*; &c [a]. And the ſame *Father*, giving an account of another *Greek Expoſitor*, he had been reading, *on the ſtory of Melchiſedec*, ſays juſt the ſame of him too, *that he allegorized the whole in ſuch a manner, as to deſtroy the hiſtorical truth of it* [b].

St. *Auſtin* tells us; *that there were ſome, who interpreted the whole account of Paradiſe of things to be underſtood ſpiritually or allegorically, as if the things themſelves had not been really viſible, or corporal, but delivered for the ſake of thoſe ſpiritual ſignifications* [c]. And though he declares on this occaſion for *holding faſt the Letter, along with the Allegory*; yet 'tis certain that he had once been of a different mind, and thought, that we could not explain *the Hiſtory of Man's Fall piouſly and worthily of God but in the allegorical way* [d]; and ſeems to have always held the ſame conſtant opinion, as to *the ſix days of the Creation*, and to have looked upon them *as wholly allegorical* [e].

Thus, Sir, in direct contradiction to what you maintain, there were *ſeveral Writers in the primitive Ages, who thought the beſt way of vindicating Scripture in ſome inſtances to be by the help of Allegory, even to the deſertion of the Letter:* and this without any imputation on their zeal or ſincerity in their Religion, or the leaſt ſuſpicion of *Infidelity.* 'Twas the ſame caſe with the *Jewiſh Apologiſts*, particularly *Philo*, from whom I had drawn ſome teſtimonies to the very point: but you tell me peremptorily, *that I have miſtaken the ſenſe of every one of them* [*a*]. And to give us a general view in what ſenſe *Philo* is to be underſtood, you obſerve, *that he more than once cautions his readers againſt departing from the Letter of the Old Teſtament*, and ſays, *that all the Ceremonies relating to the Worſhip of the Temple and a thouſand other Precepts would be neglected, if we were to confine ourſelves onely to the allegorical Interpretation.* But what is this to the purpoſe? Or how does it confute what I have advanced? Is there the leaſt hint in *my Letter*, or the *Defence of it*, that *Philo* or the *Primitive Writers* maintained the *whole ſenſe of Scripture to be allegorical?* Might not *Philo* believe the *general ſenſe* to be *literal*, and yet hold ſome *particular paſſaget* to be wholly *allegorical?* This ſurely is conſiſtent, and that it was the very caſe, we ſhall preſently ſee. For inſtance; *the Law*, ſays *Philo*, *accounts the Camel an unclean beaſt, becauſe though he chews the cud, he does not divide the hoof*; *now if we conſider this according to the outward Letter, 'tis hard to ſay, what ſenſe there is in it*; *but if according to the inward meaning*; *there is a moſt clear and neceſſary one*, &c. which he proceeds to explain. This paſſage I had produced before [*b*]; but as you have ſaid nothing to it in *your Reply*, I muſt confront you with it once again, the better to confine you to the *true ſtate of the queſtion.* Let me aſk you then, whether *Philo*, in this inſtance, does not *actually vindicate Scripture by its allegorical meaning, in oppoſition to the literal one?* If he does; then all you have been ſaying about him has neither *truth nor ſenſe* in it: if he does not; then I am content to take whatever ſhame you pleaſe to throw upon me; even *the ſhare* you ſo candidly give me of *Mr.* Woolſton's *ſhame* [*c*].

---

[a] Hieron. Op. T. 4. par. 2. p. 310. Edit. Benedict.

[b] Ib. Tom. 2. par. 1. p. 574.

[c] De Civ. Dei. l. 13. c. xxi.

[d] De Geneſ. contr. Manich. l. 2. c. iii.

[e] De Civ. Dei. l. 11. c. xxx.

You ſay that Philo *turns almoſt every thing to Allegory*; and yet by your uſe of him, one would imagine, that he had *turned nothing*

[*a*] Rep. to Def. p. 51. [*b*] Defence, p. 17. [*c*] Rep. to Def. p. 51.

thing to Allegory. But to drop for the preſent what you or I think, let's ſee what other Men of Learning, not heated in this Controverſy, have thought of him with regard to this very queſtion. *Philo,* ſays *Photius, wrote Expoſitions on the Old Teſtament, turning almoſt every where the Letter to Allegory: and from him all that Cuſtom of allegorical Interpretation flowed into the Church* [a].

Sixtus Senenſis tells us of him, that *he affirms it to be a piece of ruſtick ſimplicity to believe literally, that the World was created in ſix days or in any certain time. And that ſeveral Catholick Authors had followed his opinion, as* Auſtin *among the* Latins, *and* Procopius *among the* Greeks [b]*: That he ſo treats what* Moſes *has ſaid of Paradiſe, as to deſtroy the literal Senſe of it; making the Garden, the Plants, and the other things deſcribed in it to contain nothing but Allegory. In which error he was followed,* he ſays, *by* Origen, *and very many Writers beſides,* as he ſhews afterwards [c]: and he declares, *that St.* Ambroſe *likewiſe in imitation of* Philo *ſeems to have underſtood the ſtory of Paradiſe wholly according to Allegory, rejecting the hiſtorical Senſe of it* [d]. And if we would know this Author's own opinion of *allegorical Interpretation*; he affirms it to be *by far the moſt uſeful for the eſtabliſhment of our Faith, and the inſtitution of our Manners:* and ſays further, *that ſhould the enemies of the Law and the Prophets object to us and demand, for what reaſon God gave ſuch abſurd Laws; to cut off the Foreſkin, kill the Lamb, the Goat,* &c. *we ſhould have no way of defending ourſelves but by the allegorical Senſe; without which all thoſe things muſt needs appear inſipid, ruſtick, and wholly unworthy the Divine Majeſty* [e]. And now, have I advanced any thing like this in favour of Allegory? Yet the Author who has advanced it, was a Man highly eſteemed and celebrated in his own time, not onely for his Learning, which was great, but for his *Piety and ſincere Zeal for Religion,* which were allowed to be as great.

---

[a] Phot. Biblioth. p. 277.

[b] Sixt. Senenſ. Biblioth. l. 5. p. 338.

[c] Ibid. p. 340.

[d] Ibid. 341.

[e] Ibid. l. 3. p. 141.

To this Writer, who was a *Papiſt*, I ſhall juſt add a *Proteſtant*, *Rivetus*; who in theſe Points was as *highly orthodox*, and as great *an Advocate of the Letter* as yourſelf. Who declares, that St. *Auſtin* held *the ſix days of the Creation* to have an *allegorical Meaning onely*, and that *Philo*, *Procopius*, *Cajetanus are of the ſame opinion* [a]. Of the *laſt of whom* he intimates, that he held *the literal ſtory of* Eve *formed from the rib of* Adam *to be a ſilly one* [b].

By this time the Reader will be able to judge how *raſh* or *bold*, as you ſay, my Aſſertion is, *that the Primitive Fathers and Jewiſh Apologiſts eſteemed the allegorical Expoſition to be on ſome occaſions the beſt Method of vindicating Scripture.* But becauſe you puſh me ſo vigorouſly on this queſtion, I muſt beg leave to dwell a little longer on it.

Joſephus reflecting on the calumnies charged on the *Jews*, and the ridicule they underwent on the account of *the Tabernacle and prieſtly Veſtments* [c], ſays, that *whoever ſeriouſly conſiders the fabrick and conſtruction of them, will find the Lawgiver to have been a Divine Man, and that they are falſly reproached on this ſcore. For if we duly examine the Particulars with judgment and without envy, we ſhall diſcover them all to have been formed in imitation, or as a typical repreſentation of the Univerſe and its ſeveral Parts:* and he proceeds to explain this analogy or ſimilitude through all its Particulars. *The Tabernacle thirty cubits long, divided into three Parts, denotes*, he ſays, *the earth, the ſea, the heavens: the twelve loaves, the twelve months: the ſeven branches of the candleſtick, the ſeven planets*, &c. Now what is all this but recurring to *Allegory*, in order *to vindicate Scripture* from the *cavils and ridicule of Scepticks?*

I had produced likewiſe in *my Defence* a teſtimony from *Barnabas*; where *this Apoſtolical Writer* declares, that Moſes *in prohibiting Swine's fleſh, meant onely to prohibit the keeping company with ſuch, as in their manners are like to Swine* [d]. And what do you ſay to this paſſage in *your Reply?* Why, you allow it to be a *ſtrong one* to the purpoſe; yet have the aſſurance to ſay, that I have *miſtaken every Paſſage produced to that purpoſe* [a].

---

[a] Rivet. Exercitat. in Geneſ. c. 1. p. 9. Op. T. 1.

[b] Ibid. Oper. T. 2. p. 936.

[c] Antiq. l. 3. c. 7,

[d] Defence, p. 17.

I have alledged alſo *two other Quotations*, on the authority of *Cotelerius*, from *Tertullian* and *Origen*. Where the firſt ſays, *that nothing is ſo contemptible as the Moſaic Laws about the diſtinction and prohibition of animal food.* And the latter more freely; *that if we take them literally they are unworthy of God, and leſs rational than the Laws of Men*; *nay, that ſome of them are contrary to reaſon, and impoſſible to be obſerved* [b]. And here you take notice, *that I have ſtopped ſhort, not like a lover of truth*, without acquainting the reader with an obſervation, that follows, of *Cotelerius himſelf: that on the contrary very many paſſages might be collected out of the ſame Authors, which ſpeak in praiſe of the ſame Laws* [c]. But has *Cotelerius* produced any of thoſe paſſages? If he had, it would have been pertinent to conſider, how far they had balanced, or ſuperſeded the other. But ſince he has not done this, and what he has ſaid is not, as you have given it, but what ſhould be rendered, that *many paſſages might be collected from the ſame Fathers, expreſſed more commodiouſly in praiſe of the ſame Laws:* ſo, till we ſee the Paſſages themſelves, and underſtand the force of what you had left out, *more commodiouſly*; the different paſſages may, for any thing we know to the contrary, be very well reconciled.

But you affirm, that *Cotelerius himſelf has wholly miſtaken the ſenſe of Tertullian*; and for the paſſage of *Origen*, *it effectually carries its own diſproof with it* [d]. We ſhall preſently ſee what judgment you ſhew in this affirmation. *It is plain*, you ſay, *that* Tertullian *is ſpeaking ironically of what* Marcion *and the Hereticks, and not what himſelf thought of thoſe Laws.* But it will be as plain, I doubt, that though he is ſpeaking of *the Railleries of the Hereticks*, yet he allows the ground of that Raillery to be true, and owns the fact, that the *Laws are really fooliſh and contemptible* in themſelves, according to the dictates of *human Wiſdom*, and that God made uſe of them for the very reaſon *of their being contemptible*, in order to baffle the *knowledge and learning of the wiſe.*

---

[a] Reply to Defence, p. 51, 55.

[b] Def. p. 17, 18.

[c] Reply to Def. p. 55.

[d] Ibid. p. 56, 57.

In the other paſſage, you bring from *him*, he is onely ſuggeſting ſome reaſons which the *Divine Providence* might have for the Inſtitution of ſuch Laws: to give *a leſſon of abſtinence*, and *a check to that gluttony, which*, (as he adds in words that you have wholly omitted) *when it was eating the food of Angels, yet longed for the Melons and Cucumbers of* Ægypt. An omiſſion, I don't take notice of, for the ſake of clamouring, as you do, about *falſifying and miſrepreſenting*; but to ſhew how dextrouſly you can ſkip over *a ſore place*; and evade the touching on any thing, that intimates *an inclination in the Jews*, to the *things of Ægypt*. And were I to inſiſt on the paſſage for any purpoſe of this Controverſy, you *would demonſtrate*, I dare ſay, *againſt Tertullian*, juſt as you did *againſt St. Stephen*, that *there was not ſo much as a Cucumber in* Ægypt *in* Moſes's *time.*

As to the teſtimony of *Origen*, *it carries*, you ſay, *its own confutation with it.* But, pray Sir, recollect here, what you are ſo apt on all occaſions to forget, the *real ſtate of the queſtion*; which does not turn on the truth or falſhood of what *Origen* has ſaid, but on the fact, *whether he has ſaid it or no.* If he has ſaid it, then my affirmation is true; *that the Primitive Writers eſteemed the allegorical way on ſome occaſions to be the onely method of vindicating Scripture*; and the negative you maintain is falſe. But I am at a loſs to underſtand how this *notion of* Origen *confutes itſelf.* Why, *he aſſerts*, you ſay, *that to be impoſſible, which in fact he knew to have been always obſerved.* But this ſhews onely the negligence of your own attention: for how could he be ſo groſs, as to charge an *impoſſibility*, on what he *really knew to be true?* Every one, I dare ſay, will ſee at once, that he meant ſomething very different from what you imagine, viz. *that ſome of thoſe Laws, which the* Jews *conſtantly obſerved, were yet from the nature of things impoſſible to be obſerved, in that full rigour and ſtrictneſs, which the literal command imports,* *and of which no exception or abatement was ſignified.* For inſtance; the Law, that prohibits *the eating of blood,* is *abſolute*; and the thing itſelf forbidden *in any manner or degree*; and *whoever eats it in any manner was to be cut off* [a]. Now is it poſſible to *eat any fleſh meat,* without *eating blood in ſome manner or ſome degree?* This might perhaps be one of the *Laws,* that *Origen* had regard to: where it may be anſwered, that God requires onely an *obedience adequate to our power*; and when we have diſcharged that, we have *ſatisfied the Law* however *abſolute,* or *rigorous:* yet what you anſwer is nothing to the purpoſe, and the effect onely of your own miſtake.

But ſince you ſeem to have ſo ſlight an opinion of *Origen,* as to think him abſurd enough even to *confute himſelf*; I will juſt give you a ſhort character of him, from a greater man than yourſelf; one of the greateſt that ever lived, *Eraſmus*; who declares, *that in the Expoſition of the Scriptures, allowing for ſome particular points of Faith, he would prefer one* Origen *to ten Orthodox* [b].

And now, to give my own opinion of this queſtion; I take the uſe of *Allegory in the Hiſtory of the Creation* and *Fall of Man,* to be in *ſome degree neceſſary,* to eſtabliſh the truth of the *Chriſtian Religion*; ſince all Expoſitors, who have conſidered with moſt attention the *general Scheme of Chriſtianity,* however differing in other Points, have commonly agreed in this. *Calmet* declares, that *it is extremely difficult to expound the firſt Chapters of* Geneſis *literally*; *eſpecially as to what regards the Fall of Man, and the Story of the Serpent: and that the Jews do not ſuffer their young Men under the age of twenty-five or thirty Years to read them.* And Dr. *W.* himſelf, in *vindicating one paſſage* of this very Hiſtory, about *God's walking in the Garden,* ſays, that *a Man muſt be next to an Idiot, who underſtands it literally.* As to the *Letter,* one thing at leaſt is certain, and we may aſſuredly draw *this hiſtorical truth*

---

[a] Levit. iii. 17. vii. 26, 27.

[b] At ego in Scripturarum enarratione, unum Origenem decem Orthodoxis antepoſuerim, exceptis aliquot dogmatibus fidei, in Gal. ii. 11. Crit. Sacr.

from it; that *God in the beginning created the World and all Things in it*; and *placed Man in a ſtate of bliſs and happineſs from which he fell by his own ſin and folly*. But whether this was brought about *exactly and literally*, according to every circumſtance of *the Moſaic account*; with all the *Form and Machinery*, of *ſix days labour*; a *Paradiſe*, &c. as it is not, in my judgment, material to inquire, ſo I ſhall not take upon me to determine. All that I need ſay further on it is; firſt, that I never meant *to reject the Letter of Scripture abſolutely* in any caſe, but where 'tis found *inconſiſtent with Reaſon and the Attributes of God:* and there *all Divines* whatſoever muſt agree with me *in rejecting it*. Secondly, that had I *abſolutely rejected it* in ſome caſes; I had yet done no more than what *ſeveral Apologiſts of Chriſtianity* in all Ages had done before me, whoſe *piety and zeal for Religion* were never called in queſtion on that account.

I ſhall now in the laſt place give a diſtinct account of my Sentiments, concerning the *Divine Origin and Inſpiration of the Scriptures*. And as in *my Letter to Dr.* W. I had declared myſelf a *ſincere Chriſtian*, and repeated the ſame declaration in *my Defence* of it; ſo I had reaſon to expect, that however free and offenſive any of my expreſſions might appear to ſome, whom a narrow circle of life and ſtudies had rendered ſtiff in particular habits and opinions, yet in virtue of ſuch a declaration *my belief of an Article ſo fundamental*, would have been preſumed and taken for granted, and that I ſhould have been ſafe at leaſt from the *groundleſs and ſpiteful charge of Infidelity*; ſince in the character of *a Chriſtian* I take to be neceſſarily included a *general belief of the Divine Origin and Inſpiration of the Books of the Old and New Teſtament:* a Doctrine too clearly delivered *in the Scriptures*, to be doubted of and called in queſtion by any one, who lays claim to that title. And as to the particular character and caſe of *Moſes*; I take him to have been *a great Prophet and Lawgiver*, who in an *extraordinary and miraculous* manner was *favoured*, *aſſiſted*, *and inſpired by God in the inſtitution of his Laws and Religion*, and conſequently had a *Divine Authority*, which is frequently appealed to and confirmed *in the New Teſtament*.

But as 'tis neceſſary to believe *of the Scriptures in general*, that they are *divinely inſpired*; ſo 'tis as neceſſary, from the evidence of plain facts and declarations in *thoſe very Scriptures*, to allow ſome exception to *the general rule*; nor to inſiſt, as ſome do, that *every word*, *ſentence*, *narration*, *hiſtory*; *or* indeed *every Book*, we call *canonical*, was *dictated by God*.

This is the onely notion expreſly affirmed by me, that can be thought to *weaken* in any manner *the Divine Authority of the Chriſtian Religion*: and 'tis indeed the onely one I ever intended to affirm on the ſubject: and if any thing be ſaid or puſhed further by me in either of my Pieces, than what the conſequences of this poſition will fairly juſtify, I retract and diſclaim it.

Here then I fix my foot; and take upon me to aſſert, that we are under no obligation of *Reaſon or Religion* to believe, that *the Scriptures are of abſolute and univerſal Inſpiration*; or *that every paſſage* in them was dictated *by a Divine Spirit*: and this I do from no other motive or view in the world, but a firm perſuaſion of the truth of it; and a perſuaſion likewiſe, that the allowance and declaration of that truth is not onely uſeful, but neceſſary to *a rational Defence of Religion*.

Now as this, I ſay, is the onely opinion, that I have directly aſſerted in this Controverſy, without the leaſt notice taken of it by you in *either of your Replies*; ſo did I not ſee you diſpoſed rather to *cavil at trifles* than *to join iſſue* on any queſtion of importance, I might reaſonably take it for a proof, that you look upon it as *orthodox and inoffenſive*. However, ſince paſſion and prejudice have ſo great a power in the world; and the ſeeds of rage may be already at work in the breaſts of ſome readers on the bare mention of ſuch a propoſition; I cannot but think it prudent, before I enter on any explication of it, to place in front before me *an authority or two of great name*, in order to break the force of the ſtorm, which, by what I have already experienced, I have too much reaſon to be apprehenſive of.

The firſt authority I ſhall produce is of Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*; whoſe words, in a *Sermon* on this very Subject, are as follow.

I ſhall onely ſay this in general; that conſidering the end of this Inſpiration, which was to inform the world certainly of the mind and will of God, it is neceſſary for every Man to believe, that the inſpired Penmen of Scripture were ſo far aſſiſted as was neceſſary to this end: and he that thinks upon good grounds, that this end cannot be ſecured, unleſs every word and ſyllable were immediately dictated, he had reaſon to believe it was ſo: but if any Man upon good grounds thinks the end of writing the Scripture may be ſufficiently ſecured without that, he hath no reaſon to conclude, that God, who is not wanting in what is neceſſary, is guilty of doing what is ſuperfluous. And if any Man is of opinion, that Moſes *might write the Hiſtory of thoſe actions, which he himſelf did or was preſent at, without an immediate Revelation of them; or that* Solomon, *by his natural and acquired Wiſdom, might ſpeak thoſe wiſe ſayings which are in his* Proverbs; *or the Evangeliſts might write what they heard and ſaw, or what they had good aſſurance of from others; as St.* Luke *tells he did: or that St.* Paul *might write for his Cloak and Parchments at* Troas, *and ſalute by name his friends and brethren; or that he might adviſe* Timothy *to drink a little wine,* &c. *without the immediate dictate of the Spirit of God, he ſeems to have reaſon on his ſide. For that Men may without an immediate Revelation write thoſe things, which they think without a Revelation ſeems very plain. And that they did ſo, there is this probable argument for it, becauſe we find the Evangeliſts in relating the diſcourſes of Chriſt, are very far from agreeing in the particular expreſſions and words, though they do agree in the ſubſtance of the Diſcourſes: but if the words had been dictated by the Spirit of God, they muſt have agreed in them. For when St.* Luke *differs from St.* Matthew, *in relating what our Saviour ſaid, it is impoſſible, that they ſhould both relate it right, as to the very words and forms of expreſſion; but they both relate the ſubſtance of what he ſaid,* &c [*a*].

Now if we reflect on the *difference of ſtile in a Sermon*, from that of *a debate* in a Controverſy of Learning; and conſider the reſerve proper to the one, and the freedom neceſſary to the other; we ſhall find that I have affirmed nothing more in effect, than what this great Man had delivered from the *Pulpit*. He tells us, we ſee, *that thoſe who do not believe* Moſes *to have been univerſally inſpired in writing his Books, ſeem to have Reaſon on their ſide*; and ſuggeſts ſome probable arguments to prove, that *the Evangeliſts in compoſing theirs had no Revelation at all.*

[*a*] *Tillotſon*'s Works, Vol. III. p. 449.

To the authority of *the Archbiſhop*, I ſhall add that of *Grotius*; whoſe words are: *I have truly ſaid, that all the Books in the* Hebrew *Canon were not dictated by the Holy Ghoſt: that they were written with a pious affection of mind, I do not deny: and this is what the Great Synagogue determined, to whoſe judgment the* Hebrews *in this matter ſtand. But there was no occaſion for hiſtories to be dictated by the Holy Spirit: 'twas enough for the Writer to have a good memory as to the things related, or diligence in copying the old Records. Beſides, the word, Holy Ghoſt, is ambiguous; for it either ſignifies, as I have taken it, a Divine Inſpiration, ſuch as the ordinary Prophets had, as alſo* David *and* Daniel *ſometimes; or it ſignifies a pious motion or impulſe to deliver ſome ſalutary precepts of life, or things political and civil; in which ſenſe* Maimonides *takes it, where he treats of Writings either hiſtorical or moral. If* Luke *had written his Books by the dictates of Divine Inſpiration, he would have choſen rather to eſtabliſh his Authority on that, than on the faith of the witneſſes he followed. So in writing the* Acts, *which he had ſeen done by* Paul, *he had no need of any Inſpiration. Why then do we receive* Luke's *Books, as Canonical? becauſe the Primitive Church judged them to be piouſly and faithfully written, and concerning things of the greateſt moment to Salvation* [a].

Under the ſhelter of theſe great names, of the *moſt rational Preacher*, and *the moſt rational Expoſitor of Scripture*, that any *Chriſtian Age* has produced, I may venture to open my own opinion the more freely; ſo far at leaſt, as to ſhew the grounds on which 'tis built, which is all I think neceſſary at preſent, reſerving the fuller diſcuſſion of it to an opportunity of more leiſure.

---

[a] Grot. Votum pro pace, Artic. de Canonicis Scripturis, Op. T 4. p. 672.

Now in ſearching *the Scriptures*, to diſcover the real ſtate of this queſtion, I found it to no purpoſe to lay much ſtreſs on thoſe texts, that are uſually alledged on the occaſion; ſince by admitting a latitude and variety of interpretation they furniſh nothing deciſive, but leave room ſtill for freſh and endleſs ſquabbles: my buſineſs was to conſider chiefly the *matters of fact* delivered there; the ſureſt foundation to build any perſuaſion upon; and to attend to the plain ſenſe and language of *thoſe facts*, when ſtript of the gloſſes and forced interpretations which *Commentators* would faſten on them in favour of *their ſyſtems* and *prejudices*.

For inſtance, as ſoon as *the Children of Iſrael* had made their retreat from *Ægypt*, and got any time to repoſe themſelves in the wilderneſs; we find *Moſes* employing himſelf *from morning to night in judging the people*, by *hearing and deciding all cauſes of diſpute among them*: this *Jethro his Father-in-law* obſerving, and reflecting on the fatigue and trouble it occaſioned both to *Moſes and the people*, took the liberty to repreſent to him *the inconveniencies of this method*, and to convince him, that it was *quite wrong*, and what muſt of courſe tire out both himſelf and the multitude. He adviſed him therefore for his own eaſe, as well as the publick good, to chuſe out a number of able and honeſt men, to be ſet over the people as *their Judges* or *Rulers* in all ordinary caſes; in a proper ſubordination to each other according to their ſeveral abilities; *Rulers over thouſands, over hundreds, over fifties, over tens*; reſerving to himſelf the cognizance onely of *greater cauſes*: That he might not be drawn off from the more important part of his duty, *his attendance upon God*, and *the care of his Religion*. Upon which, *Moſes*, as we read, *hearkened to the voice of his Father-in-law, and did all that he had ſaid* [*a*]. And from what is related afterwards of the ſame fact, we learn, that *Moſes* had the *ſolemn conſent and approbation of the people*, before he put it in execution [*a*]. *Joſephus*, in his account of this ſtory, takes occaſion very juſtly to praiſe *the modeſty and ingenuity of* Moſes, *in not aſſuming to himſelf the credit of an invention ſo uſeful; but frankly aſcribing all the glory of it to its true Author* [*b*],

---

[*a*] Exod. xviii. 24.

Now the inference I draw from this, is, that it appears very clearly from this *plain fact*, that *Moſes* in the caſe of *an Inſtitution* of great importance to the *whole body of his people*, and to the *good order and government of the Community*, had not the aſſiſtance of *any divine Inſpiration*, but derived the whole thought and deſign of it, from the advice and counſel of a wiſe and prudent man, of whom all that we know is, that he was *Prieſt of* Midian. If then there was *no Inſpiration* in the thing itſelf, there could be no occaſion for any in the narration of it; and conſequently *Moſes was not conſtantly and uniformly inſpired by God*, either in what he inſtituted, or what he has related.

As to what Biſhop *Tillotſon* has ſuggeſted in the other caſe of the Evangeliſts; and *Grotius* more particularly in *that of St.* Luke; 'tis certain, that there is in the *ſeverals Goſpels* ſuch a *diſagreement and variation in the accounts of the ſame facts*, as cannot by any wit of man be cleared from *the charge of Inconſiſtency*. As *in the Genealogy* of *Chriſt* [*c*]; in the account of *the woman who poured a box of ointment* [*d*]; of *two men poſſeſſed with Devils* [*e*]; of *two blind by the way ſide* [*f*]; of *the Thieves on the Croſs* [*g*]; of *the time and hour of our Saviour's crucifixion* [*h*]; of *the circumſtances of what paſſed at his Sepulchre* [*i*], &c.

The Commentators, I know, have with fruitleſs pains ſtrained hard to *reconcile theſe differences*; and work them all up into *one*

[*a*] Deut. i. 13.

[*b*] Antiq. l. 3. c. 4.

[*c*] Mat. i. 1. Luke iii. 24.

[*d*] Matth. xxvi. 6. Mar. xiv. 3. Luke vii. 38. John xii. 1.

[*e*] Matth. viii. 28. Luke viii. 26.

[*f*] Matth. xx. 30. Mar. x. 46. Luke xviii. 35.

[*g*] Matth. xxvii. 44. Mar. xv. 32. Luke xxiii. 39.

[*h*] Mar. xv. 25. John xix. 14.

[*i*] Matth. xxviii. 2. Luke xxiv. 4. John xx. 11.

uniform and conſiſtent narration: but it had been, in my opinion, of more *ſervice to Religion*, had they been content rather to acknowledge fairly, what cannot be denied honeſtly, than labour as they do to ſupport *notions* in oppoſition to *things*; *ſyſtems* in contradiction to *facts*. For all theſe variations, as they affect onely *the circumſtances*, and not *the reality of the facts themſelves*; ſo they are ſo far from *hurting the cauſe of Chriſtianity*, or caſting *any blemiſh on the veracity of the Evangeliſts*, that they the more effectually confirm it. *This very thing*, ſays *Theophylact*, *gives the ſtronger proof of their integrity, that they have not agreed in all points: for otherwiſe they might be ſuſpected to have written by compact* [a].

Mark is obſerved by *all Expoſitors* to tread ſo cloſely *on the ſteps of* Matthew, and to agree *ſo minutely* with him in the circumſtances and even words of many of his narrations; that ſome believe him to have had *the uſe of* Matthew's *Goſpel* towards the forming his own: and what does *Religion* gain by the bargain? What fruit does it reap from this *great harmony?* Why, to find Mark's *authority diminiſhing* in proportion to *his exact agreement with* Matthew, and the character of an *Evangeliſt* dwindling into that of a *Tranſcriber*; which the Criticks generally impute to him [b]. The caſe would be ſtill worſe, were the *ſame minute agreement* obſerved in the *other Goſpels*; and the ſtrong foundation of a *Quadruple Teſtimony* would by that means be reduced to the queſtionable credit of *a ſingle Evidence*; ſo that as Dr. *Hammond* has judiciouſly remarked; *theſe variations in the Evangeliſts were neceſſary to make their teſtimonies ſeveral, and ſo to give them the greater authority by the number of them* [c].

---

[a] Δὶ αὐτὸ γὰρ τοῦτο μᾶλλον ἀληθεύουσιν ὅτι μὴ κατὰ πάντα ὡμοφώνησαν, &c. Theophyl. Procem. in. Matt.

[b] Marcus pediſſequus & breviator ejus videtur, *Auguſt. de Conſ. Evan. l.* 1. *p.* 3.

Marci Evangelium ejus, quod a Matthæo proditum eſt, videri poteſt Epitome. *Eraſm. in Luc.* i. 1.

Marcus autem Græcè compendium magis hiſtoriæ, quam hiſtoriam ſcripſerat. *Grot. Ibid.*

Uſum eſſe Marcum Matthæi Evangelio, apertum facit collatio. *Grot. in Mar.* i.

[c] *Hammond*'s Præf. to Aunotat. on *Tit. Goſpel*, p. 4.—.

But tho' theſe little *inconſiſtencies in the Goſpels* cannot be of any diſſervice, but of real uſe to Religion; yet they effectually confute the common *notion* and *hypotheſis*, that the *Evangeliſts* in compoſing them were under *the perpetual influence of a Divine, unerring Spirit.* For as Biſhop *Tillotſon* reaſons above, if they had been *abſolutely inſpired*, they muſt neceſſarily have *agreed as abſolutely* in their ſeveral Stories: but *ſince they are very far from agreeing in their accounts of what our Saviour ſaid*, 'tis impoſſible that *they ſhould all be inſpired*, as 'tis impoſſible that *they ſhould all be in the right.* This concluſion is clear and evident to every Man's ſenſe and reaſon; as certain, as the facts, 'tis grounded on, are certain: allow but the facts, and you of courſe eſtabliſh this conſequence. And in truth, whatever any *Divines* think fit to impute to the *Evangeliſts*, the *Evangeliſts themſelves* are ſo far from pretending to this privilege, of *univerſal Inſpiration* or *abſolute Infallibility*, that they in effect diſclaim it; and put their whole credit on a foundation meerly human, and common to all other Writers; *viz. their capacity or ability to know the truth of what they deliver, and their integrity in delivering it to the beſt of their knowledge* [*a*].

St. *Paul*, we know, declares himſelf on ſeveral occaſions *deſtitute of divine Inſpiration.* In *the Epiſtle to the Galatians*, *I ſpeak*, ſays he, *after the manner of men* [*b*]. Where *Jerom* obſerves, *that he makes good what he ſays*, and *by his low and vulgar reaſoning, and the improper application of certain words, might have given offence to prudent men, had not he prefaced, as he does, by diſavowing all pretence to Divine Inſpiration* [*c*].

Many *facts and paſſages* might be produced from the *Old and New Teſtament*, to ſhew, that the *Sacred Writers* could not be *univerſally inſpired:* but I have ſaid enough *to declare my own opinion*, as well as to give a ſhort view of *the grounds* on which 'tis built, which I ſhall always be ready to explain more at large, if ever I am challenged to it by any Writer worth my notice.

[*a*] Luke i. 1, 2. Jo. xix. 35. it. xxi. 24. it. 1 Ep. Jo. i. 1, 2, 3.

[*b*] Gal. iii. 15.

[*c*] Unde manifeſtum eſt, id feciſſe Apoſtolum quod promiſit: nec reconditis ad Galatas uſum eſſe ſenſibus, ſed quotidianis & vilibus, & quæ poſſent, niſi præmiſiſſet, *ſecundum hominem dico*, prudentibus diſplicere, Hier. Comm. in Gal. 3. Op. T. 4.

I have now gone through all, that I found neceſſary to remark on *your ſecond Reply*. What I have omitted to take notice of, was not for want of a proper anſwer, but that I thought it either too trifling to deſerve any; or that it had been ſufficiently anſwered before. And after all this ſquabbling, the ſtate of the queſtions affirmed by me in the Diſpute ſtands thus:

1. That *the* Jews *borrowed ſome of their Ceremonies and Cuſtoms from* Ægypt.
2. That *the* Ægyptians *were in poſſeſſion of Arts and Learning in* Moſes's *time.*
3. That *the Primitive Writers, in order to vindicate Scripture, thought it neceſſary in ſome caſes to recur to Allegory.*
4. That *the Scriptures are not of abſolute and univerſal Inſpiration.*

Theſe are the *chief* if not the *onely facts*, that I have in any manner declared for in *my Two Pieces:* and after all that has been ſaid, I do not find the leaſt reaſon to change my opinion in any of them: they all ſtand in the end of the Controverſy, as firm as they did in the beginning; as every reader will obſerve: and what greater proof can be given of the impertinence of *Two Replies*, than that they have left *the principal Facts*, in diſpute in the ſame ſtate as they found them? If therefore, Sir, you ever attempt a *third*, it will be expected, that you expreſly and directly attack *theſe very Facts*, or elſe your attempt will be nothing at all to the purpoſe.

I muſt obſerve likewiſe, that, after all this *clamour and ſenſeleſs charge of Infidelity*, I have ſhewn my Sentiments to be entirely agreeable, to what the *zealous and learned Advocates of Chriſtianity* have clearly aſſerted in all ages, as neceſſary to *a rational defence*

defence of it. If *Religion* indeed conſiſts in what *our modern Apologiſts* ſeem to-place it, the *depretiating moral Duties*, and *the depreſſing natural Reaſon*; if *the duty of it* be, what their practice ſeems to intimate, to *hate and perſecute for a different way of thinking* in points, where the beſt and wiſeſt have never agreed; then I declare my ſelf *an Infidel*, and to have no ſhare of *that Religion.* But if to *live ſtrictly* and *think freely*; to practiſe *what is moral*, and to believe *what is rational*, be conſiſtent with *the ſincere profeſſion of Chriſtianity*; then I ſhall always acquit myſelf like one of *its trueſt Profeſſors.*

FINIS.

REMARKS
ON SOME
OBSERVATIONS,
Addreſſed to the AUTHOR
OF THE
LETTER
TO
Dr. *WATERLAND.*

By the Author of the Letter.

REMARKS

ON SOME

OBSERVATIONS, &c.

THE *Letter to Dr. W.* had been publiſhed near three years, and the Controverſy, that followed it, quite over and almoſt forgotten, when theſe *Obſervations upon it* appeared in print: and as there ſeem'd to be very little prudence in reviving a debate that had been managed with ſo much heat; ſo it was reaſonable, after ſo long an interval, to expect at leaſt a calm and diſintereſted enquiry into the ſtate of it, and the moments of truth produc'd on either ſide.

But inſtead of this, I was ſurprized to find no argument of Learning, no point of Religion treated in them; nothing by which the publick could either be entertain'd or edified; nothing but a virulent, malicious invective; to prove the purpoſe of my writings, and even *my heart to be entirely infidel.* [p. 10.]

As to the merit of the performance, 'tis much below my notice; nor ſhould I have taken the trouble of animadverting upon it, but for the occaſion of opening my mind more clearly in ſome points wherein I find my ſelf miſrepreſented; as well as to expoſe more diſtinctly to publick view, that genuine Spirit of Modern Orthodoxy and its Advocates, which I have declared againſt ſo freely, as pernicious to publick peace and liberty: for had this Author written on purpoſe to confirm the character I have given of it, he could not have done it more effectually, than by producing this original to confront with my picture.

He ſets out by declaring, that the profeſſion I make of an *impartial love for truth*, encouraged him to make this addreſs to me, in hopes of drawing from me an ingenuous confeſſion of my errors; and he opens his ſecond paragraph by obſerving, that *I can retract an error of inadvertence with a tolerable good grace:* this had ſome appearance of candour; and flattered ſtill the hopes I had entertain'd of a temperate review of the controverſy; but he ſcarce proceeds a line farther, before his *Orthodox Spirit* begins to work; and the encouraging hopes conceived of me in the firſt paragraph, become improbable in the ſecond, quite deſperate in the third, where I am declared *the laſt man, who will own the force of any conviction; who would ſooner give up every article of faith, than part with one doit of admiration.* [2] And as the Spiritual Thermometer riſes, with the increaſing heat of his zeal, ſo my character gradually ſinks, from *rude to profane*; [9] from *profane* to *infidel*; [10] nay *much worſe than infidel*; [39, 40] ſo profligate, that the *meekeſt man alive can't help being provok'd at me*; [9] *that charity itſelf can make no excuſe for me*; [11] and ſo abandon'd at laſt, that 'tis not poſſible for me *to believe a God.* [23, 39.]

He allows, that I have argued *againſt the Infidel plan in a manner ſtrictly concluſive*; [5] that I declare myſelf a Chriſtian; am angry for being *barely ſuſpected* of the contrary; [4] that *I diſavow all notions derogatory to the true honour of* Moſes: [21] and where my words and actions ſo well agree, there was ſome room ſurely for a charitable thought of me; ſome ground to think that I could not be in the ſame ſentiments with the man I was confuting: yet he makes no ſcruple to affirm, that *Charity itſelf cannot excuſe me*; that *'tis no breach of it to believe me an infidel.* 'Tis plain that his charity muſt be of a quite different kind from that which St. *Paul* recommends, that which *ſuffereth long, and is kind*; *that thinketh no evil*; *that believeth all things*; *hopeth all things.* [1 Cor. xiii.]

But how is it after all that he proves me to be an Infidel? becauſe I differ from thoſe, who aſſume to themſelves the title of *Orthodox*, in my notions of *Inſpiration and the neceſſity of it*; in which the writers of all ages have differed from each other, without any ſuch imputation; and the Divines are ſo divided at this day, that many will think me the ſounder Chriſtian, for the very ſame cauſe that he excludes me from the number of them. Were it worth while to retort the charge on himſelf, I could do it with much more reaſon, not by any cavils, or diſtinctions, which few people underſtand; but from plain and evident principles in which all Chriſtians agree; or to uſe his own words, from *every daſh of his pen*; *his envenom'd pages*; [2, 40] inveterate ſpite, malice, and the want of every Chriſtian grace, ſupplied onely by a *bigotted Jewiſh zeal*, and the pretext of an *Orthodox Faith*.

The cauſe of all this rage againſt me is my treating Dr. *W.* it ſeems, in ſo *rude and contemptuous* a manner; [p. 4] and with *ſuch ungenteel language as eyes were never ſurfeited with.* [7] Yet this rudeneſs and ſtrange language of mine amount to nothing more than *to dull, dogmatic, pedantic, bigotted* [2] names, not applied to Dr. *W.* but in general onely, to certain Divines, who by their method of vindicating Religion, ſeem to have a juſt title to them. So weak and blunt is my poor ſpleen, for want of an *Orthodox edge*; for want of being temper'd in that *holy fire!* but I muſt needs be an unequal match for writers, trained and diſciplin'd in all the arts of ſcolding: as in a fam'd *Archdeacon's late charge to his Clergy:* where inſtead of inſtructing them in Chriſtian principles; how to overcome evil with good; to recommend Religion by their practice; and conquer the prejudices of its enemies by the innocence of their lives; to excel in virtue and learning; *&c.* inſtead of this, I ſay, the whole purpoſe of his harangue is to exhort them to *call names ſtoutly*, *and to ſcold manfully:* wherever they find a *Deiſt* to call him roundly an *Atheiſt*; and a man who *believes nothing*, more *credulous*, than if he *believed every thing*. [Dr. *W.*'s ſecond Charge, p. 7, 21.]

But whatever harm my malice deſign'd to Dr. *W.* it has quite defeated itſelf, by giving the alarm to ſuch *able pens and learned hands to come in to his aſſiſtance*; [p. 6] and to this *Great Orator* of ours to celebrate his praiſes with ſo much eloquence. An *ex-*

cellent perſon; unwearied in his reſearches of uſeful ſcience; a ſucceſsful defender of one important Article; and a ſeaſonable Vindicator of the Scriptures in general. [4] *Of learning, induſtry, exactneſs of judgment remarkably great and extenſive,* [6] *one of the greateſt ſcholars and Divines of the age,* [7] &c. but the peculiar merit of the Doctor, for which all the world, he tells us, *has reaſon to thank him,* is his wonderful art of inventing *ſo many different ſolutions to the ſame difficulties; and diverſifying his arguments, ſo that ſome or other may hit and affect men of all tempers and diſpoſitions.* [6] As if the Advocates of Religion were to conſider onely what is palatable; not what is true; and to apply to the affections, not to the reaſon of men: for let his *ſolutions be never ſo many;* his arguments never ſo *diverſified;* 'tis poſſible, that they all may be falſe; and almoſt certain, that no more than one of them can be true: but no matter for that, if they *hit men's tempers* and *ſuit their apprehenſions,* 'tis juſt the ſame, we ſee, to this pious Obſervator.

But though Dr. *W.* with all his ſkill can furniſh nothing to *pleaſe my palate:* yet *he has the happineſs,* it ſeems, *to ſee all his Explications of Scripture confirmed by able pens and learned hands:* [6] and for this we are referred to the Author *of Revelation examin'd with candour.* A ſingle Author indeed, but of weight enough to ſupply the place of many. For whatever he may ſay of Dr. *W.* 'tis this Author, I know, who paſſes with our Obſervator and all others of his principles, for the very *Hero of modern Orthodoxy; the ſcourge of Infidels;* allowed to have a far better fancy for *ingenious ſolutions* than all the other *vindicators* put together.

I am angry, he ſays, with Dr. *W.* becauſe he *excels in his profeſſion, writes with ſuperior learning, and what is more unpardonable, believes what he writes.* [8] As to his *ſuperior learning,* I have no intention to diſpute it with him; eſpecially if 'tis to be meaſured by *a ſuperiority of his Faith.* My *Faith* is of an humble kind; claims no other merit, than of being a ſlave to my *reaſon;* to whoſe dictates it pays an abſolute ſubmiſſion: whatever my reaſon declares to be true, I cannot help believing; what it declares to be otherwiſe, 'tis not in my power to believe, though all the rewards in the world were offer'd me.

If Dr. *W.*'s Faith be of the ſame kind with mine; a principle grounded on the perception of truth; it might be reaſonable to allow from a *ſuperiority of his Faith*, a *ſuperiority of Knowledge*; and whenever I fall ſhort of him, I could onely ſay, what was ſaid to one, who was affirming a ſtrange ſtory; *you, who know the fact to be true, have more reaſon to believe it, than I, who do not:* in the mean while, all that I can ſay, is, that if it be not in our power to believe what we pleaſe, and if all rational faith muſt be the effect of rational conviction, then to believe or not to believe, as 'tis a thing indifferent and no way criminal, ſo ought to make no difference of character among reaſonable men: whoever takes pains to inform himſelf, and believes on the beſt information, whatever be the ſum of his faith, is certainly the ſoundeſt believer; and generally ſpeaking, it ſeems to be in minds, as 'tis in bodies, a ſure proof of ſoftneſs, where every thing that ſtrikes them, is apt to make an impreſſion.

Were I to gueſs at the character of our *Obſervator*, by the character of his writing; I ſhould take him for ſome young, academical Adventurer; who had been drawing out the flowers of his rhetorick, and emptying his Common-place-book againſt me: *Procruſtes*; *Salmoneus*; *flammas Jovis, ſonitus olympi*; *nec lex juſtior ulla*, &c. [p. 3, 21, 40]; the trite examples of every boy's declamation, are the onely inſtances he has given of his great erudition.

His ſolœciſms and blunders in language, and in ſenſe, when he labours moſt to raiſe his ſtile, confirm the ſame conjecture. He talks [39] *of eyes ſurfeiting with language*; [7] *of dirt recoiling without reaching the mark*, [8] *of fire a reſervoir to lodge infection in*, [40] &c. *reſervoirs of water* we often hear of; but this of fire is an invention of his own; and the reſt of the paragraph is a piece of nonſenſe ſo ſublime, that without attempting any explication of it, I ſhall lay it before the reader juſt as I find it. *The* *waters, earth and heavens have been ſufficiently polluted already; and this element onely remains to purify the reſt, and diſperſe the peſtilential vapours, which your envenomed pages have ſcattered in the world.* [40]

Theſe abſurdities in ſtyle and ſenſe naturally lead me to think of ſome forward youthful writer; but when I conſider his high opinion and great conceit of his own underſtanding; [10, 22, 34] his progreſs in *Orthodoxy*; his flaming zeal and holy fury that animate every page; things unknown and unnatural to a boy; I am forced to turn my thoughts to one of more years and experience: and ſhould be much concern'd for the ſake of the Univerſity which I love; if any member of it, who ſupports any character, or enjoys any honours there, ſhould be found capable of ſo wretched and contemptible, as well as ſo malicious and wicked a performance. But 'tis time to leave what is perſonal, and examine the little of reaſoning and argument he pretends to; which conſiſts of two points.

1. That I am an Infidel; labouring to weaken the authority of Scripture, and by conſequence the foundation of Chriſtianity.
2. That my book therefore ought to be burnt and myſelf baniſh'd, agreeably to my own reaſoning againſt the Author of *Chriſtianity as old*, &c.

For the proof of my infidelity he appeals to a paſſage of the Letter to Dr. *W.* wherein 'tis ſaid, that the *example of Joſephus, a learned and zealous Jew, might teach us to entertain more moderate and qualified ſentiments of the divine origin of the Law, and the divine Inſpiration of Moſes.* Upon which he begs leave *to aſk this plain queſtion*, ſufficient, he thinks, to confound me. *What can you mean by more moderate and qualified ſentiments, but that the Law had no divine origin, its Founder no divine inſpiration; ſince there can be no medium between divine and not divine?* [p. 15]

I have already explain'd my meaning very fully and very clearly on this head [*a*]; but ſince he either cannot or will not comprehend me, I am content to declare it once more: That whereas the modern Advocates of Chriſtianity inſiſt, that every word of the *Moſaic writings muſt be received as divinely inſpired*; *every act of Moſes as miraculouſly directed from heaven*; my opinion is, that with *the notion of general Inſpiration*, which I readily allow, we are obliged by fact and the hiſtory itſelf, to admit a diſtinction and exception, in ſome *particular paſſages of the Law*; ſome *particulars acts* of its Founder.

[*a*] See Remarks on a Reply to the Defence of the Letter, p. 68, &c.

But the greateſt ſcandal I have given, is by imputing, as he urges, ſome *kind of fiction to Moſes.* [22] I have indeed propoſed it as a problem, but with all the diffidence and caution imaginable [a], *Whether ſome degree of fiction may not poſſibly be allowed in certain caſes, to ſolve the difficulties of the Moſaic writings, without any hurt to their authority.* This our Obſervator treats as downright Blaſphemy and *Atheiſm itſelf*; [23] declares *all fiction inconſiſtent with any degree of Inſpiration,* [21] *unworthy of a man divinely inſpired:* [31] and reproaches me for defending *political lying, for the good of the people*; *and being the firſt Chriſtian writer that ever maintain'd ſo ſtrange doctrine.* [20]

I do not take notice of this to defend Political Lying, or to confirm my own reaſoning, but to expoſe the folly and raſhneſs of his. What I mentioned on that ſubject, I drew from the *beſt Moraliſts of the Heathen world*; and ſhewed withal, by the teſtimony of ſome of the *Primitive Fathers,* that the notion was ſuppos'd to be borrowed from *Moſes* himſelf: and it were as eaſy to ſhew, what he ſo raſhly denies, that almoſt all the Chriſtian Writers, from the earlieſt Ages, and very beſt Authors of Morality in theſe later times, *Grotius, Puffendorf,* &c. hold it to be as innocent in ſome caſes, to *deceive the people for their good,* as for *Parents to deceive their Children, Phyſicians their Patients*; which is all the length that I have ever gone or ever meant to go in favour of any deceit or fiction whatſoever.

But this, he tells us, *is giving a greater power to Governours,*

---

[a] See *Defence of a Letter to Dr. W. p.* 45. It. *Remarks on a Reply.* p. 50, 51.

than God himſelf claims; *of diſpenſing with the ſacred and inviolable laws of truth.* [20] Strange how he chanced to ſtumble on *the ſacred and inviolable laws of truth:* writers of his claſs never raiſe their thoughts ſo high; or venture ſo far from ſhore; but ſtick cloſe to the *infallible word, and univerſal Inſpiration of the Bible.* If there be any ſuch laws, as without all doubt there are, 'tis certain that the Bible itſelf muſt be tried by them. And if they can't be diſpens'd with by God, there ſeems to be little ſenſe in what Dr. *W.* often alledges in his vindications of Scripture; that *the command of God alters the nature of the thing:* for is not *that to diſpenſe with his ſacred and inviolable laws?* But our Obſervator, having over-ſhot himſelf here, before he was aware, makes a quick retreat into his old trenches of *abſolute Inſpiration*, and leaves the laws of truth and reaſon to ſhift for themſelves.

He affirms *all degrees of fiction to be inconſiſtent with any degree of Inſpiration.* Yet it would not be difficult to give inſtances of *ſome degree of it*, through all the *inſpired Writers* both of the Old and New Teſtament. Pray what was St. *Paul* doing, when he became *all things to all men?* Was he not employing *ſome little degree* of fiction? When our Saviour appeared to the Diſciples going to *Emmaus*; the very purpoſe of his appearing was, *to tarry with them a while in the inn*; yet *he made as if he would go farther, till they conſtrain'd him.* (*Luke* xxiv.) Is not this likewiſe ſome *ſmall degree of it?* how raſh then is his Aſſertion; that the leaſt *degree of fiction is inconſiſtent with his nature, whoſe Law is the truth?* [23]

But I *take ſhelter*, it ſeems, *in partial Inſpiration, and bring the great names of Grotius and Tillotſon to protect me in it.* Upon which he obſerves, that *had I done as much for Chriſtianity as they, I might have had ſome plea to be indulg'd in the like particularities.* [33] A fine obſervation truly! as if a greater merit gave a greater right to deliver what was falſe or hurtful to Chriſtianity: no, the greater their ſervices, the greater is the preſumption, that they were ſtill carrying them on, perfecting their work: and in my opinion, they could not have done greater, than by beating down the ſyſtems and prejudices of zealots, and fairly owning facts that lie open and viſible to every rational Chriſtain. But they, it ſeems, *onely modeſtly ſuggeſt, that in a few inſtances of no moment, the ſuperintendence of the Holy Spirit might be ſuſpended.* Yet their few and modeſt ſuggeſtions reach ſo far as to intimate; that in *the hiſtorical,* and even *the moral books of Scripture* there is no neceſſity for Inſpiration; ſince natural Talents are ſufficient to diſcover and evince the truth: contrary to our Obſervator's aſſertion, that all *the influence and truth of Scripture depend on its Inſpiration.* [31] As if nothing could be true, or deſerve to be conſider'd as ſuch, unleſs *divinely inſpired.*

'Tis the reaſoning of all divines, that the *truth of the Goſpels* ſtands on the ſame bottom with every other *hiſtorical truth* in the world: and conſequently, to deny their authority, is to deny the faith and truth of all hiſtory, and to deſtroy at once the credit of all antiquity. This reaſoning is juſt and ſtrong, if the Goſpels be of the ſame claſs and ſpecies with other hiſtories; a narration of facts by credible perſons, who knew them to be true, and related what they knew of them: but 'tis of very little force, if they muſt needs be received as *univerſally and abſolutely inſpired by God:* for in this view they have no relation to other hiſtories; ſtand on a quite different bottom; and their credit may be diſputed, without hurting common faith or common hiſtory.

To give aſſent to facts affirmed by proper witneſſes, as 'tis an act highly rational, ſo 'tis all that is wanted to give them a reception in the world. The character of Inſpiration ſuperadded ſerves onely to introduce difficulties and doubts, where all was clear before, and caſt an air of impoſture over the whole. In the caſe therefore of the Goſpels, where, according to *Grotius* and *Tillotſon,* there is no want of ſuch Inſpiration, and where we find no claim or pretence to it; the aſſerting it to be neceſſary ſeems dangerous to Chriſtianity itſelf, by unhinging and perplexing its proper and natural evidence.

But beſides the great names of *Grotius* and *Tillotſon,* I brought a greater a greater ſtill for my opinion, that of St. *Paul*; who owns himſelf on ſome occaſions *deſtitute of divine Inſpiration.* This our Obſervator grants in two places; but for a third, where the Apoſtle declares, that he *ſpeaks after the manner of men* [*a*], he affirms it to be *nothing to the purpoſe:* [25] for if *he did not ſpeak after the manner of men,* ſays he, *how would it be poſſible for men to underſtand him?* But if thoſe words of St. *Paul* relate to the manner of ſpeaking onely, what occaſion for a diſtinction, where there can be no difference, whether *inſpired or not?* for in both caſes he muſt *ſpeak to the ſenſes,* and draw his arguments from *the notions of men,* or they could be no arguments at all to mankind. No, he ſeems to me to ſignify here what he does in the other places, that he is not delivering the dictates of God, but his own natural ſentiments, as other men ordinarily do.

St. *Jerom* confirms this opinion, as our Obſervator allows, but whilſt he allows the thing, with the uſual art of theſe writers, he cavils at my words; and exclaims, that *Jerom does not ſay, what I make him to ſay,* that St. *Paul diſavows all pretence to divine Inſpiration.* [26] And yet, 'tis the whole purpoſe of *Jerom*'s argument to aſſert and prove the very thing. But to ſhew the contrary, he gives us, what he calls a *juſter tranſlation than mine, and nearer the original of Jerom's words.* The old method of blowing up envy againſt me; by calling that a *tranſlation,* which I never deſign'd for ſuch; but for an extract onely of an Author's ſentiments; which is the caſe at preſent: for does not *Jerom,* in the place I refer to, affirm, that St. *Paul has miſtaken the ſenſe, and made an improper application of a certain word, on which his argument turns?* This, though intimated by me [*b*], is not found in the words I produce, but is found however in the context, which our Obſervator could not be ignorant of. With what face then does he call that a *tranſlation,* and arraign it as imperfect, which he knows could never be meant for one? 'tis onely to raiſe a clamour and ſupport the falſe charge he revives againſt me, *of perverting and miſapplying my principal teſtimonies.* [43]

[*a*] Gal. iii. 15.

[*b*] *See* Remarks on a Reply, 78.

To return to the caſe of Inſpiration, he allows, that St. *Paul* on ſome occaſions declares himſelf deſtitute of it. [25] Yet in ſpite of St. *Paul*'s conceſſion and his own, he perſiſts ſtoutly to maintain the *abſolute and unlimited Inſpiration of all the Scriptures; that their influence and truth depend upon it.* [31] *That there's a neceſſity to admit or reject the whole.* [34] *That the onely baſis of Chriſtianity is the infallible truth, and univerſal Inſpiration of the ſacred Books.* [43] What pure and genuine Orthodoxy is this? to believe againſt the conviction even of ſenſe; againſt the evidence of plain fact; to ſubdue reaſon, judgment, and every faculty to Faith.

As for the reaſon of his Faith, he tells us gravely, that *partial Inſpiration will in the end be no Inſpiration at all.* [34] For, when *every man has pick'd and cull'd out of his Bible what he does not like, very little of genuine Inſpiration will be left behind.* But muſt we then reject a fact becauſe of its conſequences? and muſt we not be content with our Religion, juſt as God has given it us? To ſtrengthen what is from God, by adding to it, is juſt as impious as to weaken it by detracting from it. *Partial Inſpiration* is a fact, which the hiſtory and teſtimony of the Scriptures themſelves demonſtrate: whatever be the effects of it, 'tis neceſſary to ſubmit to them. It may probably overthrow the Syſtems of ancient or modern Divines; but cannot poſſibly hurt any truth or article of Faith, that is neceſſary to be believ'd.

2. I proceed now to the other part of our Obſervator's argument, or the ſentence he has pronounced againſt me; *that my book ought to be burnt, and my ſelf baniſh'd.* This he pretends to ground on my own reaſoning againſt the *Author of Chriſtianity as old*, &c. that ſince I have *ſuggeſted this as a juſt puniſhment of an Author, in many reſpect leſs criminal than my ſelf, and thought him worthy of ſo rigorous a treatment, my puniſhment ought to be the more remarkably ſevere.* [40, 41] But here again, as in moſt other places, he miſtakes and miſrepreſents me. I have

declar'd no opinion; ſuggeſted nothing about it of my own: my meaning was to ſtate a mere fact, as it ſtood among the ancients; and to wipe off a ſcandal imputed to Chriſtianity, of having introduced into ſociety a ſpirit of perſecution unknown to the Heathens; by ſhewing, in contradiction to the *Author of Chriſtianity as old*, &c. that the Pagans puniſh'd men for opinions; had their *Holy Wars* and *Religious Teſts* as well as we. I am far from affirming with our *Obſervator*, that theſe principles *are right*, *agreeable to Chriſtianity*, *the maxims of Reaſon*, *and the laws of Society:* [40] no; my opinion is juſt contrary; that Reaſon was as muſt abuſed then, as Chriſtianity is now, whenever any free debate or inquiry after Truth is made puniſhable for the ſake of it; or indeed for any other cauſe, than as it actually diſturbs the quiet of the State. My reaſoning againſt the *Author of Chriſtianity as old*, &c. is a mere argument *ad hominem*; to prove that an attempt to aboliſh Chriſtianity is contrary to the very maxims of Reaſon and Morality, that he himſelf lays down. If I do not miſtake his purpoſe; I take my reaſoning to be juſt: if I do; my argument is ſo far weaknen'd by it, as 'tis pointed ſingly againſt a deſign to ſubvert the eſtabliſh'd Religion, in order to advance Reaſon in its place, as a more perfect guide to the people.

If the Religion of a country was to be conſider'd onely as an Impoſture; an engine of government to keep the people in order; even there an endeavour to unhinge it, unleſs with a deſign to ſubſtitute a better in its ſtead, would in my opinion be highly unreaſonable. But ſhould the Prieſts of ſuch a Religion, for the ſake of their authority and power, labour to impoſe their own fictions for divine truths; to poſſeſs the people with an enthuſiaſtic zeal for them; manageable onely by themſelves, and to be played even againſt the government, as oft as it ſerved their ſeparate intereſts; in ſuch a caſe, 'tis the duty of every man, who loves his country, and his fellow creatures, to oppoſe all ſuch attempts; to confine Religion to its proper bounds; to the uſe for which it was inſtituted; of inſpiring benevolence, modeſty, ſubmiſſion into the people: nor ſuffer the credit of it to grow too ſtrong for that of the State; the authority of the Prieſt, for that of the Magiſtrate.

Was Religion, I ſay, to be conſider'd as an impoſture, all men would think this conduct reaſonable: and where it is in reality a *Revelation from Heaven*, the caſe is not altered, as far as the end of that Revelation is perverted and abuſed by the arts or the folly of men: as the *Jewiſh* was by the *Phariſees*; the *Chriſtian* by ſome of its *modern Advocates*. In ſuch circumſtances, in proportion as a man values his Religion, and believes it to be of God, he will exert himſelf to clear it from all human impoſitions; which render it either of no effect, or of a miſchievous one to ſociety; propagating *rage and ſtrife and every evil work*, inſtead of the peace and happineſs 'twas deſign'd to introduce. And if the end of all Revelation be to enforce with greater vigour, and by means more affecting to ſenſe, the obligations of the natural Law; thoſe Prieſts are the trueſt friends to God and man, who labour to adapt it the moſt effectually to that end; to expound it by the known principles of reaſon and morality; and to make it amiable, by making it plain, rational, intelligible to common underſtandings.

As for thoſe, who take the contrary way; who either deny all natural law, or make it bend as they pleaſe, to their own comments on Scripture; who build Religion on a principle of faith, diſtinct from reaſon; look on the latter with a jealous eye, as an inſtrument and engine of Satan; who meaſure all truth by authority; all credibility by teſtimony; by which authority ſtill and teſtimony they mean little more than their own, and to draw the greater dependance on themſelves; for theſe writers, I ſay, 'tis the duty of every rational Chriſtian, to expoſe their principles, as ſlaviſh and ſuperſtitious; deſtructive of that good, for which all Religion was given; turning the beſt thing in the world into the worſt; a Revelation from heaven, into a doctrine hurtful and pernicious to mankind.

And; where Religion, as with us, is received as of divine Authority, and on the beſt grounds and reaſons embrac'd as ſuch; though I greatly condemn the perverſeneſs of conteſting truths ſo ſtrongly eſtabliſhed, yet I cannot think it agreeable either to Reaſon or Religion, to puniſh even ſuch, as are hardy enough to call in queſtion the reality of Revelation itſelf: for 'tis the greateſt weakneſs and abſurdity to think, that truth can ever be hurt by any examination whatſoever: it may be oppreſſed a while by faction, ſtifled by power; but in a free debate, as in free air and exerciſe, it always regains its ſtrength and vigour: controverſy to truth, is like a gentle wind to trees; it ſhakes the head, but faſtens the root. Truth is naturally ſo amiable, that wherever 'tis expos'd to view, it neceſſarily draws all to admire it; and the more 'tis expos'd, the more ſtrongly it attracts. Where artifice indeed and fraud prevail in the ſtead of it, there all inquiry muſt induſtriouſly be diſcouraged, as a dangerous and fatal enemy; ſure to detect and expoſe the cheat: and wherever 'tis diſcourag'd, there's always reaſon to ſuſpect ſome latent impoſture: now as ſure as Truth and Falſhood are contrary to each other; ſo ſure it is, that the ſame method of treating them cannot poſſibly be of ſervice to both.

As far as my experience has reached, either in ancient or modern Hiſtory, there's not an inſtance on record, where a fair examination has ever done harm to a good cauſe. The attacks on Chriſtianity, urged on by its warmeſt enemies, always turn to its advantage: they engage the Clergy to ſtudy and ſearch into the true grounds of it; keep them in breath and exerciſe; and train them by conſtant diſcipline, to be able champions and defenders of it: they clear Religion it ſelf of all the ruſt and rubbiſh, which by the negligence or the art of its managers, it may have contracted: and above all, they enforce and lay open the genuine proofs of it; which by time itſelf, naturally grow languid and ineffectual; till a new debate, like a new publication, ſends them freſh again into the world, in their original force and luſtre.

'Tis then my firm principle and perſuaſion, that a free inquiry into all points of Religion, is always uſeful and beneficial; and for

that

that reaſon never to be puniſh'd or prohibited. It opens the minds and reforms the manners of the people; makes them reaſonable, ſociable, governable; eaſy to ſuch as differ from them, and as little ſcandaliz'd at the different opinion, as the different complexion their neighbour: whereas the reſtraint of this liberty, and the impoſition of ſyſtems and articles, that muſt not be call'd in queſtion, nouriſhes a churliſh ſpirit of bigotry, uncharitableneſs, enthuſiaſm, which no Civil Power can moderate; a ſpirit that has ſo oft involv'd mankind in wars and bloodſhed; and by turns endanger'd the ruin of every Chriſtian Country in the World.

If therefore in my argument againſt *Chriſtianity as old*, &c. I am underſtood to recommend or ſuggeſt in any manner the reaſonableneſs of puniſhing the Author; I diſclaim and diſavow it, as contrary to my intention and my principles: all ſuch puniſhment is againſt the intereſt of ſociety; the intereſt of truth; the intereſt of Religion itſelf: which, as it could not have been propagated at firſt, but by a liberty of thinking, writing, preaching; ſo cannot be preſerv'd in its purity, but by the very ſame means.

To return then to our Obſervator's ſentence; that *my books ought to be burnt and my ſelf baniſh'd*. As for my books, there's no ſaving them from the flames: but *for my perſon, he is willing to commute the puniſhment, from exile abroad, to confinement at home.* [41] But leſt we ſhould ſuſpect him of any humanity or compaſſion in the propoſal, he ſoon gives us to underſtand, that 'tis but to haraſs and plague me the more by it: the commutations of theſe men are not to mitigate, but enhance the rigour of puniſhment. I am to be kept at home, that he and all others of the ſame ſtamp may rail, preach, and pray over me, till I become a *ſtanding ſpectacle* [41] of terror and example to all who dare to expoſe their Schemes. This puts me in mind of the poor *Jews* at *Rome*; who every week in Lent are oblig'd to attend a ſermon, and hear an angry Monk preach at them, and call them names by the hour, out of the ſame Chriſtian principle, that our Obſervator profeſſes, the ſame *honeſt intention of convincing them.* [12]

But I have already undergone, he ſays, *the worſt ſort of baniſhment a liberal mind can ſuffer; a total one, from the hearts and affections of all good men:* [42] *that the cordial friendſhip, the love and real eſteem, with which I uſed to be treated, is now dwindled into cold reſpect and a diſtant complaiſance.* He does me the honour then to allow, that I was once a favourite, cordially eſteem'd and belov'd by all, till an averſion to my opinions created an averſion to my perſon. As if a man were the leſs amiable for ſome particular ſentiments, or the leſs ſincere for declaring them: ſtrange character of friends! whom neither old acquaintance, nor eſteem, nor a long intercourſe of friendly offices could reſtrain from diſcarding me, when diſcovered to think differently from them. Would not the ſame men who baniſh me thus from their affections, as readily baniſh me from all ſociety? Nay, have they not attempted to do it, as far as it was in their power? and will ſuch a conduct do credit to any ſet of men, in a country where reaſon and liberty have any influence? Can *theſe good men*, who diſcard me, charge me with any falſhood or treachery in friendſhip? with the refuſal of any good office in my power; any act of humanity or courteſy to any of them? No, as they cannot charge me, I'm ſure, with any offence in practice, ſo I am the eaſier under the diſgrace I ſuffer for what is merely ſpeculative.

But whatever I have loſt with our *Obſervator's good men*, I have the comfort to find with others; *good enough* for me; who admit me to their company and honour me with their friendſhip. Men of enlarged Minds and generous ſentiments; who make true religion the rule, and virtue the end of their living; who take immorality to be the greateſt hereſy; and meaſure the merit of their friends, not by their faith, but by a nobler principle, their charity; who reckon it no breach of frendſhip to differ in opinion; and even value me perhaps the more, for what the others perſecute me. With men of this turn I ſhall breathe at leaſt freſh air; and have more pleaſure in the eaſe of one hour's converſation, than in years ſpent with the moroſe and the captious; under the ſlaviſh fear of offending, by ſtarting any thing out of the road and train of popular thinking.

I have now followed our Obſervator thro' all his chain of reaſoning; which I could not have ſubmitted to, but to relieve ſome ſhort intervals of leiſure in an abſence from books: and tho' I think him very injudicious in the choice and uſe of his materials, yet I muſt allow him to have ſhewn ſome art in the diſpoſition of them. For having obſerv'd in what vogue the Seſſions Paper has been in of late, and what demand for that kind of reading; he has contriv'd, we ſee, to throw his own papers into that form: the *Trial and Conviction of a notorious Infidel*; *the Sentence pronounc'd againſt him*; *his Confeſſion, and Recantation*; *with the Ordinary's Sermon, and long Prayer at his Execution.* What juſtice has been done me in the trial, I muſt leave to the judgment of others; but for the *Confeſſion* here drawn up for me, I declare it to be falſe and ſpurious; ſuch as I never did, nor ever will ſubſcribe. Strange, that a man can be ſo ſilly as to imagine, that were I diſpoſed to recant, I ſhould not do it in my own words, rather than his! but I have nothing to recant on the occaſion; nothing to confeſs, but the ſame *four Articles*, that I've already confeſs'd.

1. *That the Jews borrowed ſome of their cuſtoms from Ægypt.*
2. *That the Ægyptians were poſſeſs'd of arts and learning in Moſes's time.*
3. *That the primitive Writers, in vindicating Scripture, found it neceſſary ſometimes to recur to Allegory.*
4. *That the Scriptures are not of abſolute and univerſal Inſpiration* [a].

Theſe are the onely crimes that I have been guilty of againſt Religion: and by reducing the Controverſy to theſe four heads; and declaring my whole meaning to be compriz'd in them, I did in reality *recant* every thing elſe, that thro' heat or inadvertency had dropt from me; every thing that could be conſtrued to a ſenſe hurtful to Chriſtianity. But this is a Recantation that does not pleaſe *our Obſervator*; *theſe four heads*, he ſays, *may be de-*

---

[a] See Remarks on a Reply, &c.

bated innocently: [29] and *no recantation* will ſatisfy him, but what carries crime and guilt along with it. What pity it is that *theſe inquiſitors of ours* have not the power of the rack to extort what confeſſions they pleaſe? All that this good man aims at, is to make me odious and deteſtable to every body; with a true *Popiſh Spirit*, he would draw me in to recant, and then proceed to burn; or with the old revenge of an *Italian*; firſt make me blaſpheme, and then ſtab me.

But after ſo much bitterneſs of ſpirit, ſo much malice and rancour diſcharg'd againſt me, 'tis ſurprizing at laſt to ſee with what gravity he cloſes the whole, with *a long formal Prayer* for my converſion. He talks of *ſome wretches who ſay the Lord's Prayer backwards.* [19] What he means by it I cannot tell: but if to *pray backwards*, be to invert the intent and uſe of Prayer; to make it abominable to God, ridiculous to man; he muſt needs be the greateſt Maſter of it, who thinks *forty pages of railing* a proper preface to *four of praying* [*a*]. This it is, after all, that does the greateſt hurt, and gives the greateſt ſcandal in Religion, to ſee ſuch deadly venom and miſchief cover'd by a maſk of Piety. It was the characteriſtick, we know, of the *old Phariſees, to make long prayers and to devour Widow's houſes:* our modern ones come not a jot behind them: we here ſee the *length of this Phariſee's Prayer*; and as far as I can judge by what I have ſuffer'd my ſelf, his mouth is not more open to *pray*, than 'tis to *devour.*

[*a*] See his prayer for me, p. 42, &c.

REMARKS,
PARAGRAPH by PARAGRAPH,
UPON THE
PROPOSALS
Lately publiſhed by
RICHARD BENTLEY,
FOR
A New EDITION
OF THE
GREEK Teſtament and LATIN Verſion.

Doctus criticus & adſuetus urere, ſecare, inclementer omnis generis libros tractare, apices, ſyllabas, voces, dictiones confodere, & ſtilo exigere, continebitne ille ab integro & intaminato Divinæ Sapientiæ monumento crudeles ungues?
Petri Burmanni Orat. *Lugd. Bat.* 1720.

CAMBRIDGE, Jan. 20, 1721.

F*Inding my ſelf to be treated after a moſt barbarous manner in a virulent Libel, which bears the Title of* Dr. Bentley's Propoſals, with a full Anſwer, *&c. upon Pretence of my being the Author of* The Remarks upon the Propoſals lately publiſhed by Richard Bentley, *&c. I think it neceſſary upon ſeveral Accounts to declare as follows,* viz.

That I am not the Author of thoſe Remarks, *nor any part of them, and that they were undertaken and written without my Aſſiſtance or Knowledge.*

That R. B. *certainly knew, or eaſily might have known, that they were written by the Reverend and Learned Dr.* MIDDLETON, *who had own'd them to ſeveral of his Friends, by whoſe means he verily believes, that* R. B. *was inform'd that he alone was the Author. For my own part, preſently after the* Remarks *were publiſh'd, I took all Occaſions to declare as above, being obliged in Juſtice ſo to do, leſt my Silence might in ſome meaſure contribute to deprive my worthy Friend of the Honour due for ſo excellent a Performance; nor do I queſtion but that* R. B. *before he began to write his Libel, had been acquainted with what I ſaid on thoſe Occaſions.*

That thoſe foul Aſperſions, which are caſt upon me in almoſt every Page, are as falſe in Fact, as they are apparently malicious; which is notorious to all who know me, and to none more than R. B. *himſelf.*

That I never wrote any Libels againſt the Government, the College, or the Maſter, as he falſly aſſerts.

I never wrote any thing at all relating to the Government, or publiſh'd any thing concerning the College, or the Maſter, except a Commemoration Sermon in Dec. 1717, *which the Maſter pretended to approve of, giving it under his Hand that he would ſubſcribe to every Word of it. As to other matters relating to either, I have hitherto thought them fit only for the Cognizance of a Viſitor.*

JOHN COLBATCH, D. D. Senior Fellow of *Trinity* College, and Caſuiſtical Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of *Cambridge.*

REMARKS,

PARAGRAPH by PARAGRAPH,

UPON THE

PROPOSALS

Lately Publiſhed

By *Richard Bentley*, &c.

I Shall not trouble myſelf with making any Apology for the following *Remarks* ; but ſhall only deſire the Reader to believe, that (whatever Prejudices may lie againſt them) they were not drawn from me by *Perſonal Spleen*, or *Envy* to the Author of the Propoſals, but by a *Serious Conviction* that he has neither Talents nor Materials proper for the Work he has undertaken, and that *Religion* is much more likely to receive Detriment than Service from it : The *Time*, *Manner*, and other Circumſtances of *publiſhing theſe Propoſals*, make it but too evident, that they were haſtned out to ſerve quite *different Ends*, than thoſe of *Common Chriſtianity* ; and I think it my Duty to obviate, as far as I am able, the Influence they might have on ſome whom *big Words* and *bold Attempts* are apt to lead implicitely into an high Opinion and Admiration of the Merit and Abilities of the Undertaker.

The Title runs thus:

H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ *GRÆCÆ. Novum Teſtamentum Verſionis Vulgatæ, per Sanctum* Hieronymum *ad vetuſta Exemplaria Græca caſtigatæ & exactæ. Utrumque ex antiquiſſimis Codd.* MSS. *cum Græcis tum Latinis, edidit* Richardus Bentleius.

REMARKS.

Some People are puzzled to find out the meaning of the word *GRÆCÆ*, unleſs it be placed there *exegetically*, to let us know what Language ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ is of; but our Editor ought then to have gone on, and after *Novum Teſtamentum* have added likewiſe *in Latin*, which is juſt as Critical and Elegant as the other. The very next Words ſeem to be little better than a Barbariſm, *Novum Teſtamentum Verſionis Vulgatæ*; if he had quite inverted the Order and Conſtruction of them, all had been clear and intelligible, *viz. Verſio Vulgata Novi Teſtamenti*; but the other is hardly juſtifiable by any Rules of Grammar. And tho' it may have been the Stile of ſome other Editions, or might be allowed in a *Commentator*, yet is not ſuch *Latin* as we expect from a *Critick*.

It is obſerved likewiſe, that he does not deal quite ſo honourably, as he ſhould with his *Partner Mr. John Walker*; for tho' in the cloſe of the Propoſals he allows him *half the Profit*, and almoſt *all the Trouble* of this Work, yet he here reſerves the *whole Reputation* of it to himſelf with an *Edidit Richardus Bentleius.*

Paragraph the Firſt.

The Author of this Edition, obſerving that the Printed Copies of the New Teſtament, both of the Original Greek and Antient vulgar Latin, were taken from Manuſcripts of no great Antiquity, ſuch as the firſt Editors could then procure; and that now by God's

Providence there are MSS. in Europe, *(acceſſible, though with great Charge) above a Thouſand Years old in both Languages; believes he may do good Service to common Chriſtianity, if he publiſhes a New Edition of the* Greek *and* Latin, *not according to the recent and interpolated Copies, but as repreſented in the moſt antient and venerable MSS, in Greek and Roman Capital Letters.*

REMARKS.

Our Author, we ſee with all his Zeal for *Common Chriſtianity*, makes no Scruple to deſtroy here at once the Authority of all our *publiſhed Scriptures*, and by a kind of *Papal Edict* cries down all our *current Editions* as corrupt and adulterate, 'till coined and ſtamped anew by his Authority.

But the Injuſtice and Barbarity of this Cenſure on all *former Editors of the New Teſtament*, will eaſily appear by the ſhort Account I ſhall give of two or three of the *principal Editions*; and 'tis ſuch an *Inſult* upon the Senſe and Judgment of the Learned World, which has always ſet the higheſt Value upon many of them, that it cannot but raiſe an univerſal Reſentment and Indignation.

The Editors of the *Celebrated Complutenſian Edition*, printed 1515, were furniſhed by *Pope Leo* the Tenth with *all the Manuſcripts of the* Vatican; beſides many others of the *greateſt Antiquity*, procured from diſtant parts of *Europe* by the Power and Intereſt of *Cardinal Ximenes*, the Patron and Promoter of the Work: Many of theſe we find deſcribed under the Characters of *Venerandæ vetuſtatis*, *Spectatæque fidei*, and ſome are ſaid to be above *twelve hundred Years old:* The Cardinal, in his Prefatory Epiſtle to the Pope, ſays thus; *Et Caſtigatiſſima omni ex parte vetuſtiſſimaque Exemplaria pro Archetypis haberemus, quorum quidem tàm Hebræorum quàm Græcorum & Latinorum multiplicem Copiam non ſine ſummo labore conquiſivimus.*

And the Editors in their Prologue ſay likewiſe; *Non quævis Exemplaria Editioni huic Archetypa fuiſſe, ſed Antiquiſſima Emendatiſſimaque*

datiſſimaque & tantæ præterea vetuſtatis, ut fidem eis abrogare Nefas videatur.

Gomeſius, *De rebus geſtis* Ximenii, lib. 2. tells us, what *great Pains and Expence the Cardinal was at in procuring Manuſcripts from* Rome, *and other foreign Parts, as well as all the Libraries of* Spain; and ſays, that *ſeven only of his Copies fetched from different Countries, coſt him four thouſand Aurei.*

Dr. *Mills* ſays, that theſe Editors had collected *Lautam plane Codicum Manuſcriptorum ſupellectilem*; and ſtiles the Edition *Primam & Nobiliſſimam*, and, *Opus nunquam ſatis Celebrandum*. And *our very Editor*, if we may judge of his Opinion of this Edition by his Uſe of it, has fairly convicted himſelf, and may be brought as an Evidence for its Authority, having cited it near as often *in his Specimen* as any *Father* or *Manuſcript* of them all.

Eraſmus formed his *Edition* by *Collating* and *Comparing* a great many of the moſt *correct and ancient Manuſcripts*, both *Greek* and *Latin*; his Words are, *Univerſum ad Græcæ Originis fidem recognovimus, idque non temerè neque levi Operâ, ſed adhibitis in conſilium compluribus utriuſque Linguæ codicibus, nec iis ſanè quibuſlibet ſed Vetuſtiſſimis ſimùl & Emendatiſſimis. Præf. ad Leon.* X. And in another Place, *Ad Græcæ Originis fidem examinatis codicibus Latinis neque tamen fidentes paucis aut quibuſlibet.* Dr. *Mills* compares *one of* Eraſmus's *Greek Manuſcripts* to the *Alexandrian itſelf*, which is ſuppoſed to be above *twelve hundred Years old.*

Rob. Stevens collected the Text of his Edition from *no fewer* than *Sixteen* of the beſt and moſt *ancient Manuſcripts*, ſome of which are deſcribed by him to be *Ipſâ vetuſtatis Specie pænè adorandos*; and our Editor himſelf, in his Remarks upon the Freethinkers, owns *this Edition, generally ſpeaking, to be an accurate one*, which from him is a very extraordinary Character.

I need not mention the many other Editions we have of good Note; but ſhall leave it to the Reader to determine from theſe I have named, how juſt and modeſt our Author has been in this Paragraph; and whether *Manuſcripts of no great Antiquity, recent and interpolated*, be the proper Tranſlation of

Antiquiſſima Emendatiſſimaque Venerandæ Vetuſtatis Spectatæque ſidei.

But however barbarous this Treatment of our *firſt Editors* may ſeem, it is ſtill much more unpardonable in reſpect to one of our laſt; I mean the *Learned Dr. Mills*, who with incredible Pains and Induſtry for thirty Years together, has drawn together in his elaborate *Edition of the New Teſtament*, not onely whatever had been collected by *all other Authors and Editors* before him, but the Collations likewiſe of all the Manuſcripts whatſoever which he had heard of or were at all famous in any part of *Europe*. There are many in his Collections above a *thouſand Years old, and in Capital Letters too*; ſome of which our Author himſelf will allow to be the moſt *ancient and valuable* in the World; and it is from this Magazine that our Propoſer (as ungrateful as unjuſt) has upon the Matter borrowed all his Materials; and as far as we may judge from theſe Propoſals, ſeems rather to copy and tranſcribe only *this Edition*, than to deſign a new one.

I may juſtly therefore turn upon him his own Words, which were applied by himſelf in Defence of Dr. *Mills* againſt the Cavils of the Free-thinkers. *Our learned Countryman Dr.* Mills, *whoſe Friendſhip and Memory will ever be dear to me, meets with a ſorry Recompenſe for his long Labour of thirty Years.*

But he tells us, that *now, by God's Providence, there are Manuſcripts in* Europe *acceſſible*, &c. as if they had never been in *Europe* till *now*; but were *juſt* now dug out of the Ground like Medals, or imported lately from the *Eaſt* or *Weſt Indies* for the Service of his Edition: But if they are ſo *acceſſible* as he ſays, it is very certain that *Library-keepers* abroad have more *Humanity*, and leſs *Envy*, than ſome I could name at home.

Paragraph the Second.

The Author, revolving in his Mind ſome Paſſages of St. Hierom; *where he declares, that (without making a New Verſion) he adjuſted and reform'd the whole* Latin Vulgate to the beſt Greek Exemplars, *that is, to thoſe of the famous* Origen; *and another Paſſage, where he ſays, that a Verbal or Literal Interpretation out of* Greek *into* Latin *is not neceſſary,* Except in the Holy Scriptures, *Ubi ipſe verborum ordo myſterium eſt,* Where the very Order of the Words is a Myſtery; *took thence the Hint, that if the Oldeſt Copies of the Original* Greek *and* Hierom's Latin *were examined and compared together, perhaps they would be ſtill found to agree both in Words and Order of Words. And upon making the Eſſay; he has ſucceeded in his Conjecture, beyond his Expectation or even his Hopes.*

REMARKS.

Here we are entertained with a ſhort Hiſtory of our Editor's great Deſign, and what an odd Accident, what a fortuitous Concourſe of Atoms gave Birth to this mighty Work; *thinking,* it ſeems, upon *ſome Paſſages of St. Hierom,* he firſt took a *Hint,* which being improved preſently into a *Conjecture,* turned it ſelf ſoon afterwards into a *Clue,* which *extricated* him out of the *Labyrinth,* and ſo the Buſineſs was done: This being therefore the applauded momentous Paragraph, on which the Reaſon and Neceſſity of this new Edition, and the whole Merit of theſe Propoſals are entirely built, it will deſerve a very particular Examination.

As for the firſt of theſe Paſſages referred to here by our Author, I much queſtion whether it is to be found in direct and expreſs Terms in any part of St. *Hierom*'s Works: It is however pretty certain that St. *Hierom* did at firſt deſign to new model and reform the *Latin Vulgate of the New Teſtament, according to the beſt Greek Copies of his time;* but finding what an Offence he was like to give by ſo great an Alteration of a Verſion which the People were fond of, and had ſo long been uſed to, he changed his Mind, and was content only to touch over and correct ſuch Paſſages where the Senſe ſeemed to have been miſtaken, leaving the reſt as he found it: This is the Account he himſelf gives us in his *Prefatory Epiſtle to Pope Damaſus* prefixed to the Goſpels:

Quæ nè multùm à Lectionis Latinæ conſuetudine diſcreparent, ita Calamo temperavimus ut his tantum, quæ ſenſum videbantur mutare, correctis, reliqua manere pateremur ut fuerant. Dr. *Mills* ſpeaking of St. *Jerom*, in relation to this very Subject, ſays, *Gaudemus quod in hâc re parùm ſibi permiſerit ac pauca duntaxat immutarit. Vid. Prolegom.* In ſo ſmall an Alteration therefore as St. *Jerom* made, it is probable, that the *Order of Words* ſtood much the ſame both before and after his Reformation; and ſo leaving our Author to make what Uſe he can of this part of his Diſcovery, and *to revolve it in his Mind* as long as he pleaſes, I ſhall proceed to conſider,

The ſecond Paſſage above cited, which is taken from the *Epiſtle to Pammachius, De optimo genere Interpretandi*; where St. *Hierom*'s Words are, *Sed liberâ voce profiteor, me in interpretatione Græcorum, abſque Scripturis ſanctis, ubi & Verborum Ordo & Myſterium eſt, non verbum ex verbo, ſed ſenſum exprimere de ſenſu.* Here we ſee that *Ordo Verborum* and *Myſterium* are plainly *disjoined* and *diſtinguiſhed* from each other, and that our Editor has thought it convenient to throw out the *Disjunctives*, and clap in an *Ipſe* to make the Words expreſs more roundly the Senſe he would put upon them.

I will not diſpute with him about the different Significations, which this Paſſage and his Citation of it might bear, but will allow him for once that both expreſs the ſame thing; yet it is very eaſie to ſhew, that he has widely miſtaken the true Senſe and Meaning of them.

The whole Subject of this *Epiſtle to Pammachius* is the Defence of a Tranſlation he had made, (not verbally, but according to the Senſe) of a Greek Letter ſent from one Biſhop to another; where, beſides alledging the Practice of profane Authors, he ſhews that the *beſt Interpreters even of Scripture* had no regard in their Tranſlations to the *Words* or *Order of Words*, but to the Senſe onely; which he proves by ſeveral Inſtances from the *Septuagint*, the *Evangeliſt*, the *Apoſtles*, the *Vulgate Edition* it ſelf, and the *Fathers*; and concludes, *Ut Reprehenſores meos arguam* *imperitiæ, & impetrem ab eis veniam, ut concedant mihi in ſimplici Epiſtolâ quod in Scripturis ſanctis, velint nolint, Apoſtolis conceſſuri ſunt*; and again, *Ex quibus univerſis perſpicuum eſt, Apoſtolos & Evangeliſtas in Interpretatione veterum Scripturarum ſenſum quæſiſſe, non verba, nec magnoperè de ordine ſermonibuſque curâſſe dum intellectui res pateret.* It is certain therefore, that this famous Paſſage can onely be rendred thus, *viz.* That St. *Hierom* in tranſlating Greek, did not endeavour to render Word by Word, but to expreſs the Senſe onely, except in *ſuch particular Places of the holy Scriptures, where & Verborum ordo & Myſterium eſt* for the Word *Ubi* muſt either have this *reſtrained* and *particular* Senſe, or this Paſſage ſtands a direct Contradiction to the whole Reaſoning and Tenor of the Epiſtle.

And ſuch *particular places* of Scripture as are here meant, muſt certainly be looked for onely in the *Old Teſtament*, which St. *Hierom* likewiſe *tranſlated into Latin from the Greek* of the Septuagint, and where the *Jewiſh Doctors and Rabbins*, and all the Writers infected with their Notions, are full of *ſuperſtitious Whims* about *Myſteries* in the *Order and Diſpoſition not onely of Words*, but of *Syllables* and *Letters.* And St. *Hierom* himſelf, after he began to grow fond of Hebrew, might probably be a little touched with theſe kind of Fancies: but no one Writer that I have yet heard of has ever affirmed, that *the Order of Words* in the New Teſtament is *myſterious.*

I could ſhew from twenty Places of St. *Hierom,* that he never in the leaſt dreamt of confining himſelf to the *Order of Words* in any of his Verſions.

In a Letter to St. *Auſtin*, ſpeaking of his Tranſlations of the Old Teſtament, he ſays, *Et ibi Græca tranſtulimus*; *hìc de ipſo Hebraico, quod intelligebamus, expreſſimus, ſenſuum potius veritatem, quàm verborum ordinem interdum conſervantes.* And again, *Quod autem genus interpretationis in Scripturis ſanctis ſequendum ſit, liber quem ſcripſi de optimo genere interpretandi, & omnes præfatiunculæ divinorum voluminum, quas Editioni noſtræ præpoſuimus, explicant.* And theſe Places he here refers us to, are full of nothing

thing but *Rules*, and *Reaſons*, and *Inſtances* of interpreting Scripture, not according *to the Words* but *the ſenſe onely*.

But I need not trouble my ſelf any farther in a Caſe ſo clear and undeniable; the Notion advanced here by our Editor, is in it ſelf abſurd and impoſſible; *Eraſmus* ſpeaking on this Subject ſays, *Si minùs verbum verbo reſpondeat, id quod ut maximè coneris, ne fieri quidem poteſt. Apolog.* which we find confirmed by Fact and Experiment; for he ſays again in relation to this *very Verſion, Si nefas eſſe ducunt uſquàm à literis ac ſyllabis diſcedere, cur hic Interpres paſſim id auſus eſt, aliquoties nulla adactus neceſſitate? &c.* And *Arias Mont.* in his Preface ſays, *Ita ut ſæpius ejus interpretatio non ad verbum, ſed ad ſententiam accipiendo ſit.* And *Beza* likewiſe; *Hoc quidèm conſtat ſæpe illam à Græcis diſcedere.* But we need go no farther for Proofs of all this than our *Author's own Specimen*, where in the *Latin Text*, as it ſtands dreſs'd up by himſelf, we ſee many conſiderable Variations in the Order of Words from the Greek, *viz.* ℣. 2, 5, 8, 9, 12, 14, &c.

Allowing then that St. *Hierom* did believe *the Order of Words to be myſterious* in a few *particular places* of holy Scripture, which neither our Editor nor any Man elſe knows where to find: What can all this ſignifie towards proving the Neceſſity of a new Edition, or of what great Uſe and Service can it poſſibly be to any Editor in ſuch a Deſign? Yet this is the ſole Foundation upon which every thing that is *new* or can be *uſeful* in our Author's Performance is entirely built; for excepting this ſilly Fancy about the *Order of Words*, he cannot do any thing more with his *old Verſion* and *old Latin Manuſcripts*, than what has been fully and effectually done before him by many other Editors.

Eraſmus ſpeaking of his own Edition ſays, *Teſtamentum Novum omni quâ licuit diligentiâ quâque decuit fide recognovimus, idque primùm ad Græcam veritatem, deinde ad fidem vetuſtiſſimorum Latinæ Linguæ Codicum.* Præfat. annotat. N. T. And Dr. *Mills* ſays, *Eraſmus inſtitutâ ſemel atque iterum Exemplarium Græcorum inter ſe & cum Manuſcriptis Codicibus Verſionis Vulgatæ Collatione, ad Editionem novi Fœderis ſe accinxit.* Vid. Prolegom.

Rob. Stephens, in the Preface of his Edition, *Anno* 1551, ſays, *Porrò Veterem Verſionem negligendam non exiſtimavi idque tribus potiſſimùm de Cauſis, primùm, quia eam multis in locis Vetuſtiſſimi Exemplaris Græci loco eſſe videbam.*

Mr. *Toinard* has alſo in a manner executed our Editor's very Scheme in his *Harmony of the Goſpels*, printed at *Paris* 1709. and owns that he borrowed the Hint from the Paſſage juſt cited of *Robert Stephens*; his Words are, *Ex qua Roberti Stephani de Veteri Interprete ſententiâ Vulgatum Textum Græcum caſtigandum putavi ex Vaticanarum illarum Lectionum & Veteris Verſionis mutuo Conſenſu.*

Dr. *Mills*, in his Prolegomena, ſays, *Veterem Novi Teſtamenti Italicam, ceu ad Exemplaria primæva compoſitum Summâ veneratione proſequimur*; and there is not one Citation of it in any of the Latin Fathers, nor any Emendation that St. *Hierom* afterwards made in it, which the Doctor has not actually exhibited and applied with great Judgment to the clearing up the genuine Greek Text; and from theſe Citations, with the help of old Manuſcripts, &c. he believes that he has *retrieved, in moſt parts of the New Teſtament, the true Readings of the old Vulgate, with the very Greek from whence they were taken,* which was probably that of the Age next to the Apoſtles.

All therefore that we can expect new from our Editor is, that having formed his Deſign upon a Notion which is not true, like all other *Authors of Syſtems*, he will be apt to wreſt and force both the *Greek and Latin* Texts, to make them anſwer, as well as he can, to his *Hypotheſis*.

In his *Sermon upon Popery*, preached at *Cambridge*, and ſince printed, he ſpeaks with ſome Contempt of the *Vulgar Latin*, as a Tranſlation made by a *private and unknown* Perſon, which muſt have *ſeveral Defects and Ambiguities from the Nature of Language, tho' the Author of it were inſpired*; that there are fewer *antient Manuſcripts* preſerved of it, than of the *Greek*, and that it has been more injured under the Hands of Tranſcribers, and expoſes the Church of *Rome* for *enhancing* (as he ſays) *the Authority* *of it above that of the Inſpired Greek*; where, by the by, he ſeems to know but little of the true State of the Queſtion, but with the common Herd of Writers, charges upon the Papiſts a good deal more than is true of them in this Caſe: The Canon of the Council of *Trent*, in relation *to this Verſion*, runs thus: *Statuit & declarat ut hæc vetus & vulgata Editio, quæ longo tot ſæculorum uſu in ipſâ Eccleſiâ probata eſt, in publicis lectionibus, diſputationibus, prædicationibus, & expoſitionibus pro Authentica habeatur:* Here we ſee no mention at all of the *Inſpired Greek*, no comparing *or enhancing the Tranſlation above the Original, the Stream above the Fountain. Vid.* Bent. *Serm. on Popery. Bellarmine*'s account of this Matter is; *Nec enim Patres Fontium ullam mentionem fecerunt, ſed ſolum ex tot Latinis Verſionibus, quæ nunc circumferuntur, unam delegerunt quam cæteris anteponerent*, lib. 2. c. 10. De Verbo Dei. *Cæteris, quæ hodierno die extant, omnibus anteponendam duximus.* Arias Mont.

The Popiſh Writers indeed ſay in Defence of this Verſion, that being made in the earlieſt Ages of Chriſtianity, from the pure Exemplars of thoſe Times, and having continued ever ſince in the conſtant Uſe and Service of the *Latin* Church, it muſt needs be of equal Authority to any *Greek* Copies now extant: And is not our Author here ſaying and doing much the ſame thing which we juſtly condemn in the *Church of Rome*; undervaluing the Credit of all the *Greek Copies*; advancing and authorizing the *Vulgar Latin*, and proving it to be the beſt means we can uſe of finding out the *true Examplars* of the Ancients?

Paragraph the Third.

The Author believes, that he has retriev'd (except in very few Places) the true Exemplar of Origen, *which was the Standard to the moſt Learned of the* Fathers *at the time of the Council of* Nice *and two Centuries after. And he is ſure, That the* Greek *and* Latin *MSS, by their mutual Aſſiſtance, do ſo ſettle the Original Text to the ſmalleſt Nicety; as cannot be perform'd now in any* Claſſic *Author whatever: and that out of a Labyrinth of Thirty Thouſand Various*

Readings, that croud the Pages of our preſent beſt Editions, all put upon equal Credit to the offence of many good Perſons; this Clue ſo leads and extricates us, that there will ſcarce be two Hundred out of ſo many Thouſands that can deſerve the leaſt Conſideration.

REMARKS.

I have not been able to find, in any Author I have yet conſulted on this Occaſion, that *Origen*'s *Exemplars of the New Teſtament* were ſo very famous for their particular Accuracy, as to be a *Standard to the moſt Learned of the Fathers*, or indeed to any Body beſides himſelf: Moſt Churches in that early Age were probably furniſhed with Copies as correct as his: *He was accuſed of many Errors; excommunicated for them by the Churches of* Alexandria *and* Rome; *was ſuſpected of doing Injury to ſome Texts; doubted of the Canonicalneſs of ſome Books of the New Teſtament; Received and made uſe of others which were Apocryphal.* And tho' St. *Hierom* in his Youth was a great Admirer of him, and owns that he copied after him in his *Commentaries*, yet he had afterwards no great Opinion of his *Fidelity* or *Exactneſs* in *handling the Scriptures*, but ſays in a Letter to St. *Auſtin*, that the Text was rather *Corrupted* than *Mended* by him.

Huetius ſpeaking of *Origen*'s interpreting the Scriptures, ſays; *Non eâdem Editione in iis interpretandis uſus eſt, in Homiliis Editionem ſequebatur Communem,* in Tomis alias *Editiones conſulebat*; and he accounts for the great Difference there is between *Origen*'s Readings of the Text, and thoſe of the common Editions, by the great Uſe he made of the *Apocryphal Goſpel to the* Hebrews; *Utebatur ſæpenumero Adamantius Evangelio ſecundùm Hebræos (ut tradit* Hieronymus, *lib. de Script. Eccleſ.* c. 4.) *atque inde diſcrepantiam illam extitiſſe conjicio.* Huetii Origeniana, lib. 3. c. 1.

Dr. *Mills* ſays in his Prolegom. *That* Origen, *in Reading and Citing the New Teſtament did not ſtick to any certain Copy, but made uſe of ſeveral different ones, and all of them in ſome places Corrupt.*

Indeed, *Origen*'s celebrated Work, called *Hexapla*, and afterwards *Octapla*, (which was an Edition of the *Hebrew* Text of the Old Teſtament, with the ſeveral *Greek* Verſions of it in different Columns) was a *Standard to the Fathers* for the Text of the *Old Scriptures*, who (excepting one or two of them) underſtood very little of *Hebrew* ; but that his Authority was not near ſo great in the *New*, as in the *Old Teſtament*, we learn from *Ambroſe*, lib. 5. Epiſt. 43. *Etſi ſciam quòd nihil difficilius ſit, quàm de Apoſtoli lectione diſſerere, cùm ipſe Origines longè minor ſit in Novo quàm in Veteri Teſtamento.* That his Exemplar therefore was received as a *Standard of the Genuine Text of the New Teſtament*, ſeems to be a groundleſs Fancy or Miſtake of our Editor.

But let this be as it will, he believes, it ſeems, that he has retrieved the *true Exempar of Origen*; and we are conſequently to imagine, that in the Chapter of his Specimen, the Text ſtands exactly the ſame, as it was read by that *great Man:* Yet upon examining his Notes, I find, that in the whole he gives us but *three* various Readings from *Origen*, and inſtead of *retrieving*, *rejects* them all as *falſe*, ℣. 11, 13.

But one main Deſign of this Edition, is, we ſee, to reduce the *exorbitant Number of various Readings, which crowd the Pages of our beſt Editions, to the Offence of many good Perſons*; which is ſuch a *piece of Grimace*, as will hardly paſs upon the World; by over acting his part he betrays his Inſincerity and Deſign of impoſing upon the Senſes of Mankind.

In his Remarks on Free-thinkers, for many Pages together, he rallies and expoſes, as weak and ridiculous, *the Offence which Dr.* Whitby, *and others, had taken at the great Number of various Readings which crowd the Pages of Dr.* Mills's *Greek Teſtament*; he wiſhes that their *Number were ſtill greater*, and proves, that the *more* they are, the *better they clear and aſcertain the genuine Text. If I may adviſe you,* ſays he, *when you hear more of this Scarecrow of Thirty Thouſand, be neither aſtoniſhed at the Sum, nor in any pain for the Text.* Pag: 68.

But now to ſerve his preſent Turn, in contradiction to himſelf, and to common Senſe, they muſt once more be made an Objection to *poor Dr. Mills*; and all of them, except a few favourite ones, are now to be diſcarded, ſerving onely to *offend* and *perplex* the pious Reader.

But he will ſay, perhaps, that it is not *their Number* which gives ſo much Offence; but that they are all put, as he tells us, *upon equal Credit by our Editors*; the contrary of which is ſo directly and evidently true, that one would wonder what he could mean by ſuch an Aſſertion. For do not our Editors, eſpecially Dr. *Mills*, give a particular and diſtinct Account of the different *Antiquity*, *Authority*, and *Correctneſs* of the ſeveral *Manuſcripts* they make uſe of: And do not they cite each Manuſcript by its diſtinct and proper Title? How then can the *various Readings* be all put upon the *ſame Degree of Credit*, whilſt the Copies from whence they are taken, are all put upon ſo different ones?

Indeed, if other Authors had contented themſelves with the ſlovenly and ſuſpicious Way of quoting Manuſcripts, which we find in this Specimen, *viz. Codd. plerique omnes Gallici quatuor, Anglici tres, Germ. unus*, &c. there might have been a good deal of Reaſon for a Charge of this Nature, which, by what is already hinted, appears in the preſent Caſe to be entirely groundleſs.

But after all, we find the *Various Readings* of the *Greek* onely near as numerous and bulky in this Specimen of his own, as in any of the *former Editions* he complains of; and if we may argue from the Proportion of them in this Chapter to the reſt of his Work, his own Pages are ſtill like *to be crowded with the old round Number of Thirty Thouſand.*

Paragraph the Fourth.

To confirm the Lections which the Author places in the Text, he makes uſe of the old Verſions, Syriac, Coptic, Gothic *and* Æthiopic, *and of all the Fathers,* Greeks *and* Latins, *within the firſt Five Centuries; and he gives in his Notes all the Various Readings (now known) within the ſaid Five Centuries. So that the Reader has under one View what the firſt Ages of the Church knew of the Text; and what has crept into any Copies ſince, is of no Value or Authority.*

REMARKS.

In this Paragraph, however *Pompous* and *Learned* it ſeems, our Author will be found even by his own Confeſſion, to fall very ſhort of what has actually been executed by *other Editors* before him; for Proof of which, I need onely produce *his own Words from his Remarks upon the Free-thinkers, Part* I. *p.* 64. where ſpeaking of what had been done in *former Editions,* long before he dreamt of publiſhing one of his own, he ſays, *Nor has the Texts onely been ranſacked, but all the ancient Verſions; the Latin Vulgate, Italic, Syriac, Æthiopic, Arabic, Coptic, Armenian, Gothic, and Saxon, nor theſe onely, but all the diſperſed Citations of the Greek and Latin* Fathers, *in a Courſe of five hundred Years:* All which is even leſs than what we find performed in the *ſingle Edition of Dr. Mills,* which is particularly referred to in this Paſſage: For beſides an Account and Examination of *every one of thoſe Verſions,* we have in the Doctor's Prolegomena, not onely *the diſperſed Citations of the Fathers of the five firſt Centuries,* but of all other *Eccleſiaſtical Writers* of any Note, and what Age ſoever: However, I cannot help agreeing with our Editor, that as it is certain he does not underſtand a tittle of *any one of the Verſions* here mentioned, he may do his buſineſs full as well with any *four,* as with them all.

How well he has kept up to this Propoſal of giving us *all the Readings now known within the five firſt Centuries, and ſlighting all the reſt,* may be ſeen in his Specimen, where he has omitted ſome Authorities that Dr. *Mills* had given, which come within his Period, ỳ. 2, 5, 7. and has made more uſe of others which fall below it, than almoſt all his Fathers put together; and condeſcends even to take notice of printed Editions.

Paragraph the Fifth.

The Author is very ſenſible, that in the Sacred Writings there's no place for Conjectures or Emendations. Diligence and Fidelity, with

with ſome Judgment and Experience, are the Characters here requiſite. He declares therefore, that he does not alter one Letter in the Text without the Authorities ſubjoin'd in the Notes. And to leave the free Choice to every Reader, he places under each Column the ſmalleſt Variations of this Edition, either in Words or Order, from the receiv'd Greek *of* Stephanus, *and the* Latin *of the two Popes* Sixtus V. *and* Clemens VIII. *So that this Edition exhibits both it Self, and the Common ones.*

REMARKS.

The Reader by this time will be pretty well able to judge how far the Character here given of a *Scripture-Editor* may be allowed to our *Propoſer*; for *his Citations from St. Hierom* may ſerve as an Inſtance of his *Fidelity*; and the Conduct and Matter of theſe Propoſals be a Proof of his *Judgment*; and his great *Experience* in *Theological Studies*, may eaſily be computed from his whole Life ſpent in *critical Niceties*, and Obſervations on *Claſſical Authors*.

But he is very ſenſible, we ſee, what a Notion the World has entertained of his *critical Faculty*, and to quiet the Apprehenſions People are under, leſt he ſhould treat the *Sacred Writers* with as little Ceremony as he has done *the Profane*, mangle and alter them at pleaſure, agreeably to his own *Taſte* and *Judgment*, without regard to the *Authority of Manuſcripts*: He here declares, that he *will not alter one Letter in the Greek of Stephanus, and Latin of the two Popes, without Authorities ſubjoined.*

But the *Dutch Orator* and *old Friend of his Peter Burman*, whom I have quoted in the Title Page, has told us already what we are to expect; and it happens very unluckily for him, that he has not the Command of himſelf to keep his Reſolution through one *ſingle Chapter*; for beſides ſome *literal Alterations* in the Greek, without *any Authority ſubjoined*, he has made an *Emendation* in the third Verſe of the *Latin*; which he owns to be *contrary to all the Manuſcrips he ever ſaw.*

Paragraph

Paragraph the Sixth.

If the Author has any thing to ſuggeſt towards a Change of the Text, not ſupported by any Copies now extant; he will offer it ſeparate in his Prolegomena; *in which will be a large Account of the ſeveral MSS. here uſed, and of the other Matters which contribute to make this Edition uſeful. In this Work he is of no Sect or Party; his Deſign is to ſerve the whole Chriſtian Name. He draws no Conſequences in his Notes; makes no oblique Glances upon any diſputed Points, old or new. He conſecrates this Work, as a* κειμήλιον, *a* κτῆμα ἐσαεὶ, *a* Charter, *a* Magna Charta, *to the whole Chriſtian Church, to laſt when all the Antient MSS. here quoted may be loſt and extinguiſh'd.*

REMARKS.

Our Author in this Paragraph, raviſhed with the great Succeſs of his Labours, and the Proſpect of his immortal Fame, cannot forbear *antedating* his future Glory, and ſigning his *Exegi monumentum* at the wrong end of his Work; but his Vanity ſeems full as ill natur'd as extravagant: for a *ſimple Immortality* will not, we ſee, content him, he muſt have no Rival: It is not enough that his Works live for ever, unleſs all others die, and his Edition muſt needs laſt, when all the *antient Manuſcripts* are not onely *loſt*, but (in a Phraſe as barbarous as the Thought) *extinguiſhed* too.

He has been ranſacking, we find, all the Languages he is Maſter of, for *proper Encomiums* to beſtow upon this Work of his; and one would think, that in *torturing the Scriptures*, he thought it neceſſary *like Pilate*, to ſet up *an Inſcription* in *three different Tongues.* Κειμήλιον, *Charter*, *Magna Charta.*

Κειμήλιον ſignifies ſome *Rarity* or *choice* piece of Furniture, *not uſed*, but always *laid up* and *kept cloſe* with great care by the Owner. *Virgil* expreſſes the force of it by *condita ſervo*, and Dr. *Mills* very properly calls the *Alexandrian Manuſcript* a Κειμήλιον; but to apply it to any *printed Edition* deſign'd for *common uſe*, and to be in *every Bodies Hands*, is *a manifeſt Impropriety* and *Contradiction in Terms*; but ſince the *Alexandrian Manuſcript* is, we find, to be *extinguiſhed*, and this Edition to take its place, it may very well by a *Prolepſis* take its Title too, and ſo the Objection is ſolved.

But he will find it more difficult, I doubt, to account for the Authority he here aſſumes, of granting *Charters and Magna Charta's to the Chriſtian Church:* The Scriptures, I know, have ſometimes been called the *Church's Charter*, and Dr. *Trot* in the Preface to his *Clavis Linguæ ſanctæ*, calls them *magnam Chartam non Regis terreſtris ſed cæleſtis ſubditis ſuis conceſſam*; which is at beſt but a coarſe kind of Metaphor, and a Diminution to the ſacred Writings: But to faſten this and the other Titles here given upon any *particular unauthorized Edition*, is an Inſolence more than *Popiſh*, and altogether new and unheard of among *Proteſtants*, and is ſo far from becoming any *private Regulator* of the Text, that it is more than any *National Church* could juſtifie to its Members: But after all his meaning may perhaps be very harmleſs, and his *Charter* and *Magna Charta* may ſignify nothing more than *his ſmall* and his *great Paper* deſcribed in the next Paragraph.

Paragraphs the Seventh and Eighth.

To publiſh this Work, according to its Uſe and Importance, a great Expence is requiſite: It's deſign'd to be Printed, not on the Paper or with the Letter of this Specimen, *but with the beſt Letter, Paper, and Ink that* Europe *affords. It muſt therefore be done by Subſcription or Contribution. As it will make Two Tomes in Folio, the Loweſt Subſcription for Smaller Paper muſt be Three Guineas, one advanc'd in preſent; and for the Great Paper Five Guineas, two advanc'd.*

The Work will be put to the Preſs, as ſoon as Money is contributed to ſupport the Charge of the Impreſſion; and no more Copies will be Printed than are ſubſcribed for. The Overſeer and Corrector of the Preſs will be the Learned Mr. JOHN WALKER *of* Trinity-

College in Cambridge; *who with great Accurateneſs has collated many MSS at* Paris *for the preſent Edition. And the Iſſue of it, whether Gain or Loſs, is equally to fall on Him and the Author.*

REMARKS.

In a Deſign like this, pretended to be undertaken for the *Service of the Chriſtian World*, any other Man would have contrived as well as he could to have kept out of ſight all *ſelfiſh Views and Motives*, all Regards to *Gain and filthy Lucre*: But we find in theſe two Paragraphs ſuch *ſordid Inſinuations*, ſuch low and paultry *higgling* to *ſqueeze our Money* from us, *viz. great Expenſe requiſite*; *ſhall be put to the Preſs as ſoon as Money is contributed*; *no more printed than ſubſcribed for*; *the beſt Letter, Paper and Ink in Europe*; *the loweſt Price muſt be, &c.* that it puts me in mind of thoſe *Mendicants* in the Streets, who beg our Charity with an *half Sheet of Propoſals* pinn'd upon their Breaſts: To what purpoſe is it to tell us that Mr. *John Walker* is to go halves with him in the *Gain or Loſs* of this Work, except to move the Compaſſion of *good Chriſtian People*, and to beg of us, however unkind we may be to himſelf, yet not to ſee a *poor young Critick* undone for want of charitable Contributions?

But indeed moſt People are agreed in Opinion, that he has borrowed his Scheme from *Change-Alley*, and in this Age of *Bubbles* took the hint to ſet up *one of his own*: For having invented a *rare Secret* to make *Paper* more durable than *Parchment*, and a *printed Book*, however uſed and tumbled about, to *out-laſt any Manuſcript* preſerved with the utmoſt Care, he preſently *takes in a Partner*, *opens Books for Subſcriptions* and does not in the leaſt queſtion but that *Bentley*'s Bubble will be as famous and profitable as the beſt of them; and ſo leaving him to carry on *his Trade*, I ſhall paſs on to an Obſervation or two upon his Specimen.

The SPECIMEN.

ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΕΩΣ ΚΕΦ. κβ΄.

1 ΚΑΙ ἔδειξεν μοι ποταμὸν ὕδατος ζωῆς, λαμπρὸν ὡς κρύσταλλον, ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀρνίου.

2 Εμμέσῳ τῆς πλατείας αὐτῆς, καὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐκεῖθεν, ξύλον ζωῆς ποιοῦν καρποὺς δώδεκα, κατὰ μῆνα ἕνα ἕκαστον ἀποδιδοῦν τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ φύλλα τοῦ ξύλου εἰς θεραπείαν τῶν ἐθνῶν.

3 Καὶ πᾶν κατάθεμα οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, καὶ ὁ θρόνος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀρνίου ἐν αὐτῇ ἔσται, καὶ οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ λατρεύσουσιν αὐτῷ.

4 Καὶ ὄψονται τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων αὐτῶν.

5 Καὶ νὺξ οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, καὶ οὐχ ἕξουσιν χρείαν φωτὸς λύχνου καὶ φωτὸς ἡλίου, ὅτι κύριος ὁ Θεὸς φωτίσει ἐπ' αὐτοὺς, καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

1 μοι καθαρὸν ποταμὸν, 2 ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐντεῦθεν. 3 πᾶν κατανάθεμα. 5 οὐκ ἔσται ἐκεῖ. καὶ χρείαν οὐκ ἔχουσι λύχνου καὶ, φωτὸς ἡλίου. φωτίζει αὐτούς.

APOCALYPSEOS CAP. XXII.

1 ET oſtendit mihi fluvium aquae vitae, ſplendidum tamquam Cryſtallum, procedentem de ſede Dei & agni.

2 In medio plateae ejus, & ex utraque parte fluminis, lignum vitae adferens fructus duodecim, per menſes ſingulos reddens fructum ſuum, & folia ligni ad ſanitatem gentium.

3 Et omne maledictum non erit amplius, & ſedes Dei & agni in illa erit, & ſervi ejus ſervient illi.

4 Et videbunt faciem ejus, & nomen ejus in frontibus eorum.

5 Et nox ultra non erit, & non egebunt lumine lucernae neque lumine ſolis, quoniam dominus Deus inluminabit illos, & regnabunt in ſaecula ſaeculorum.

3 *ſed* ſedes dei. in illa *erunt*.

I. Καθαρὸν ποταμὸν] Deeſt καθαρὸν Alex. Codd. Anglici duo, Gallici tres; Verſ. Copt. Syr. Aeth. Hilarius; Codd. Latini omnes. ſed Andreas & Arethas ποταμὸν καθαρὸν. Gall. unus, ποταμὸν ὕδατος ζωῆς καθαρόν. II. Καὶ ἐντεῦθεν] Alex. Codd. Angl. duo, Gall. quatuor, Germ. unus, Arethas, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν. III. Κατανάθεμα] Alex. Arethas, Andreas, Codd. plerique omnes, Editio Complut. κατάθεμα. *Sed* ſedes dei] Codd. Lat. plerique omnes *Et* ſedes, ut Graeci omnes καὶ *Erunt*] Ita Codd. quos adhuc vidi; Legendum *Erit*; nam Graeci univerſi ὁ θρόνος. V. Νὺξ οὐκ ἔσται ἐκεῖ] Alex. ἔσται ἔτι. Syr. Latini omnes. In Graecis pleriſque deeſt ἐκεῖ. Χρείαν ἔχουσι λύχνου] Alex. ἕξουσιν χρείαν φωτὸς λύχνου; & ſic Gregorius Palamas, & Codd. Latini omnes. Syrus. Copt. Aethiop. Φωτὸς ἡλίου] Alex. φῶς ἡλίου. Φωτίζει αὐτοὺς] Latini plerique *Illuminat*, Sed Alex. Greg. Palamas, φωτίσει ἐπ' αὐτούς.

6 Καὶ εἶπέν μοι, οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ ϗ ἀληθινοί· ϗ ὁ κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν προφητῶν ἀπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ, δεῖξαι τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει.

7 Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι ταχύ. μακάριος ὁ τηρῶν τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου.

8 Κἀγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀκούων ϗ βλέπων ταῦτα. Καὶ ὅτε ἤκουσα ϗ ἔβλεπον, ἔπεσα προσκυνῆσαι πρὸ ποδῶν τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ δεικνύοντός μοι ταῦτα.

9 Καὶ λέγει μοι, Ὅρα μή. σύνδουλός σου εἰμὶ, ϗ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου τῶν προφητῶν, ϗ τῶν τηρούντων τοὺς λόγους τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· τῷ Θεῷ προσκύνησον.

6 Et dixit mihi, Haec verba fideliſſima & vera ſunt & dominus Deus ſpirituum prophetarum miſit angelum ſuum, oſtendere ſervis ſuis quae oportet fieri cito.

7 Et ecce venio velociter. beatus qui cuſtodit verba prophetiae libri hujus.

8 Et ego Johannes, qui audivi & vidi haec. Et poſtquam audiſſem & vidiſſem, cecidi ut adorarem ante pedes angeli qui mihi haec oſtendebat.

9 Et dicit mihi, Vide ne feceris: conſervus tuus ſum, & fratrum tuorum prophetarum, & eorum qui ſervant verba libri hujus: Deum adora.

6 ϗ κύριος, deeſt ὁ. ὁ Θεὸς τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν. 7 Ἰδοὺ, deeſt ϗ. 8 Καὶ ἐγὼ. ὁ βλέπων ταῦτα ϗ ἀκούων. ϗ ἔβλεψα, ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ποδῶν. 9 σου γάρ εἰμι.

6 fideliſſima ſunt & vera.

9 Et *dixit* mihi. Conſervus *enim* tuus. verba *prophetiae* libri.

VI. Καὶ κύριος] Alex. ϗ ὁ κύριος. Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν] Sic edidit Eraſmus. Sed Complut. Alex. Arethas, Graeci. Codd. fere omnes, Latini omnes, Syr. Copt. Aethiop. τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν προφ. Fideliſſima ſunt & vera] Codd. veteres, fid. & vera ſunt. VII. Ἰδοὺ] Καὶ ἰδοὺ Alex. Andreas, Arethas, Syrus, Codd. Graeci plerique omnes, Latini ad unum omnes. VIII. Καὶ ἐγὼ Ἰω. ὁ βλέπων ταῦτα ϗ ἀκούων] Alex. Andreas, Complut. Syrus, Latinus, Codd. Graeci plures. Κἀγὼ Ἰω. ὁ ἀκούων ϗ βλέπων ταῦτα. Dionyſius Alexandrinus bis, Κἀγὼ ὁ βλέπων ϗ ἀκούων ταῦτα. Ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ποδῶν] Alex. πρὸ ποδῶν. IX. Et *dixit* mihi] Codd. veteres conſtanter, *Dicit*; ut Gr. λέγει. Σύνδουλός σου γὰρ εἰμὶ. & Vulg. Conſervus *enim* tuus ſum] Atqui Alex. Arethas, Andreas, Athanaſius, Copt. Syr. Graeci Codd. omnes tollunt γὰρ; & Latini itidem omnes & Cyprianus tollunt *enim*. Verba *prophetiae* libri] Latini veteres omnes tollunt *prophetiae*.

10 Καὶ λέγει μοι, Μὴ σφραγίσῃς τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· ὁ καιρὸς γὰρ ἐγγύς ἐστιν.

11 Ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπαρευθήτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι.

12 Ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι ταχύ· καὶ ὁ μισθός μου μετ' ἐμοῦ, ἀποδοῦναι ἑκάστῳ ὡς τὸ ἔργον ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ.

13 Ἐγὼ τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ω, πρῶτος καὶ ἔσχατος, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος.

14 Μακάριοι οἱ πλύνοντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν, ἵνα ἔσται ἡ ἐξουσία

10 Et dicit mihi, Ne ſignaveris verba prophetiae libri hujus: tempus enim prope eſt.

11 Qui nocet noceat adhuc, & qui in ſordibus eſt ſordeſcat adhuc, & juſtus juſtitiam faciat adhuc, & ſanctus ſanctificetur adhuc.

12 Ecce venio cito: & merces mea mecum eſt, reddere unicuique ſecundum opera ſua.

13 Ego A & Ω, primus & noviſſimus, principium & finis.

14 Beati qui lavant ſtolas ſuas, ut ſit poteſtas eorum in ligno

10 τούτου· ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς ἐγγύς ἐστιν. 11 Καὶ ὁ ῥυπῶν ῥυπωσάτω ἔτι. ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἔτι. 12 Καὶ ἰδού. ἔργον αὐτοῦ ἔσται. 13 Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος. 14 Μακάριοι οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ ἵνα.

11 Et *qui* juſtus *eſt juſtificetur* adhuc.

13 Ego *ſum* A & Ω. 14 Stolas ſuas *in ſanguine agni.—& per portas* intrent.

vitae

X Ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς ἐγγύς ἐστιν.] Sic Andreas, & Cyprianus bis, *Quia jam tempus in proximo eſt.* Sed Alex. Codices Gr. plures, Syr. Copt. Latini omnes, O καιρὸς γὰρ ἐγγύς ἐστιν. Graeci ceteri ὁ καιρὸς ἐγγύς ἐστιν. deſunt ὅτι & γὰρ. XI. Καὶ ὁ ῥυπῶν ῥυπωσάτω ἔτι.] Deeſt hoc Comma in Alex. & duobus Gallicis errore Librariorum ob repetitionem τοῦ ἔτι. At ceteri fere omnes, Andreas, Arethas, Complut. ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπαρευθήτω ἔτι. Origenes ad Johannem bis, ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπανθήτω ἔτι. Idem ibid. aliud membrum addit, Ὡς ὁ Ἰωάννης φησι, καὶ ὁ καθαρὸς καθαρισθήτω ἔτι (MS. Oxon. καθαρθήτω) καὶ ὁ ἁγ. ἁγιασθήτω. Καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω] Alex. & Codd. ceteri omnes, Andreas, Arethas, Complut. Latin. Syr. Copt. δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω. Cyprianus bis; Juſtus *juſtiora faciat* adhuc. Et qui juſtus eſt juſtificetur adhuc) veteres Codd. fere omnes, Et Juſtus juſtitiam faciat adhuc. XII. Καὶ ἰδοὺ] Delent καὶ Alex. Codd. plerique omnes Arethas Complut. Syr. Copt. Latini Codd omnes. Cyprianus bis. Ἔργον αὐτοῦ ἔσται] Alex. Gallicus unus, Syr. ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ XIII. Ἐγώ εἰμι] Deeſt εἰμὶ Alex. Athanaſius, Codd. fere omnes, Andreas, Arethas. Sed Origenes habet εἰμὶ bis. Ego *ſum*] Deeſt *ſum.* Codex Sancti Germani veterrimus. Ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος] Sic Andreas, Arethas, & Codd. quidam. Sed Alex. Athannaſ. Codd. Anglici tres. Gall. duo, Syr. Latini omnes, Cyprianus, alio ordine, πρῶτος καὶ ἔσχατος ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος. Origines bis habet ἡ ἀρ. καὶ τὸ τέλος: ſed ordine, ut Andreas. XIV. Οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ] Ita Codd. Graeci plerique omnes, Copt .Syr. Tertull. Cypr. Sed Alex. Anglicus unus, Aeth.

Latini

αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς, ϗ τοῖς πυλῶσιν εἰσέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν.

15 Ἔξω οἱ κύνες ϗ οἱ φαρμακοὶ ϗ οἱ πόρνοι ϗ οἱ φονεῖς ϗ οἱ εἰδωλολάτραι, ϗ πᾶς φιλῶν ϗ ποιῶν ψεῦδος.

16 Ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς ἔπεμψα τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, μαρτυρῆσαι ὑμῖν ταῦτα ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ῥίζα ϗ τὸ γένος Δαυὶδ, ὁ ἀστὴρ ὁ λαμπρὸς ϗ ὁ πρωϊνός.

17 Καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ϗ ἡ νύμφη λέγουσιν Ἔρχου· ϗ ὁ ἀκούων εἰπάτω, Ἔρχου· ϗ ὁ διψῶν ἐρχέσθω· ὁ θέλων λαβέτω ὕδωρ ζωῆς δωρεάν.

18 Μαρτυρῶ ἐγὼ παντὶ τῷ ἀκούοντι τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου, ἐάν τις ἐπιθῇ ἐπ'

vitae, & portis intrent in civitatem.

15 Foris canes & venefici & impudici & homicidae & idolis ſervientes, & omnis qui amat & facit mendacium.

16 Ego Jeſus miſi angelum meum, teſtificari vobis haec in Eccleſiis. ego ſum radix & genus David, ſtella ſplendida & matutina.

17 Et ſpiritus & ſponſa dicunt, Veni: & qui audit dicat, Veni: & qui ſitit veniat: qui vult accipiat aquam vitae gratis.

18 Conteſtor ego omni audienti verba prophetiae libri hujus, ſiquis adpoſuerit ad haec,

adponet

15 Εξω δὲ οἱ κύνες, πᾶς ὁ φιλῶν. 16 ταῦτα ἐπὶ ταῖς. γένος τοῦ Δαβὶδ. λαμπρὸς ϗ ὁ ὀρθρινός. 17 λέγουσιν, Ελθέ. εἰπάτω, Ελθέ. διψῶν ἐλθέτω, ϗ—λαμβανέτω τὸ ὕδωρ. 18 Συμμαρτυροῦμαι γὰρ παντὶ

17 *Et* qui vult. 18 Conteſtor *enim* omni.

Latini Codd. omnes οἱ πλύνοντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν, Athanaſ. οἱ πλατύνοντες ποιοῦντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν, errore Librarii pro πλύνοντες. Arethas, ποιοῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς ἐμοῦ: ut ſententia illa poſtulare videtur. In ſanguine agni] Deſunt in veteribus Codd. omnibus. Per portas] Tres Codd. veterrimi *portis*, ut Graeci omnes τοῖς πυλῶσιν. XV. Εξω δὲ οἱ κύνες] Deeſt δὲ Alex. ceteri fere omnes, Athanaſius, Hippolytus, Andreas, Arethas, Complut. Latini omnes, Cyprianus. Πᾶς ὁ φιλῶν] Deeſt articulus ὁ Alex. alii multi. Sed Athanaſius, Hippolytus, cum Codd quibuſdam πᾶς ποιῶν ϗ φιλῶν. XVI. Επὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις] Ἐν ταῖς Alex Codd. 2 Gallici. Athanaſius. Deeſt præpoſitio in Codd. multis. Τοῦ Δαβὶδ] Deeſt τοῦ Alex Codd. multi. Athanaſius, Andreas, Arethas. Porro omnes Graeci Δαυὶδ, vel compendioſe δαδ; nuſquam invenitur Δαβὶδ. Λαμπρὸς καὶ ὁ ὀρθρινὸς] Alex. ϗ ὁ πρόϊνος. Sed ceteri Codd. cum Athanaſio, Andrea, Aretha, Complut. πρωϊνος. XVII. Ελθὲ ἐλθὲ—ἐλθέτω] Alex. & ceteri omnes, Athanaſ. And. Arethas, Complut. ἔρχου—ἔρχου—ἐρχέσθω. Καὶ ὁ θέλων λαμβανέτω τὸ ὕδωρ] Deeſt ϗ & poſtea ὁ θέλων λαβέτω ὕδωρ. Alex. Cod. fere omnes, Athanaſius. Andreas, Complut. *Et* qui vult] Codd. Latini veteres tollunt *Et*. XVIII. Συμμαρτυροῦμαι γὰρ] Alex. & alii Codd. plerique & Complut. & Andreas μαρτυρῶ ἐγώ: pauci cum

Aretha

αὐτὰ, ἐπιθήσει ὁ Θεὸς ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς πληγὰς τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τȣ́τῳ.	adponet Deus ſuper illum plagas ſcriptas in libro iſto.
19 Καὶ ἐάν τις ἀφέλῃ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τȣ̃ βιβλίȣ τῆς προφητείας ταύτης, ἀφελεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ μέρος αὐτȣ̃ ἀπὸ τȣ̃ ξύλȣ τῆς ζωῆς, ϗ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἁγίας, τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τȣ́τῳ.	19 Et ſiquis diminuerit de verbis libri prophetiae hujus, auferet Deus partem ejus de ligno vitae, & de civitate ſancta, [& de his] quae ſcripta ſunt in libro iſto.
20 Λέγει ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα, Ναὶ ἔρχομαι ταχύ. Αμὴν, ἔρχȣ κύριε Ιησοῦ.	20 Dicit qui teſtimonium perhibet iſtorum, Etiam venio cito. Amen, veni domine Jeſu.
21 Ἡ χάρις τȣ̃ κυρίȣ Ιησοῦ μετὰ πάντων.	21 Gratia domini Jeſu cum omnibus.
ἀκȣ́. ἐάν τις ἐπιτιθῆ πρὸς ταῦτα. ἐν βιβλίῳ deeſt τῷ. 19 ἐάν τις ἀφαιρῆ— λόγων βίβλȣ. ἀφαιρήσει ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ—— βίβλȣ τῆς ζωῆς——καὶ τῶν γεγραμ. ἐν βιβλίῳ. 20 Ναὶ ἔρχȣ. 21 κυρίȣ ἡμῶν Ιησȣ̃ Χριςȣ̃ μετὰ π. ὑμῶν ἀμήν.	19 de *libro* vitae. 21 Domini *noſtri* Jeſu *Chriſti* cum o. *vobis. Amen.*

Arethra *μαρτύρομαι ἐγὼ*: nullus, quod ſciam, *συμμαρτυρȣ̃μαι*, neque *γάρ*. Conteſtor *enim* omni] Codd. veterrimi quicumque, Conteſtor *ego* omni. Παντὶ ἀκȣ́οντι] Alex. Andreas, Arethas, Codices plures, παντὶ τῷ ἀκ. Επιτιθῆ πρὸς ταῦτα] Alex. Codd. plerique omnes Andreas, Arethas, Complut. ἐπιθῆ ἐπ' αὐτὰ. Επ' αὐτὸν] Deeſt Alex. ſed ceteri Graeci & Latini omnes cum Andrea & Aretha habent. Εν βιβλίῳ] Alex. Arethas, Andreas, Codd. plurimi ἐν τῷ βιβ. XIX. Αφαιρῆ—ἀφαιρήσει] Alex. Codd. plerique, Andreas, Arethas, Complut. ἀφέλῃ, & deinde pro ἀφαιρήσει. Alex. Arethas cum Codd. pluribus habent ἀφελεῖ: alii cum Andrea & Complut. ἀφέλοι ; & hi ſupra pro ἐπιθήσει habent ἐπιθῆ. Λόγων βίβλȣ] Τȣ̃ βιβλίȣ Alex. Codd. fere omnes, Andreas, Arethas. Απὸ βίβλȣ τῆς ζωῆς] Alex. Codd. Graeci fere omnes; Andreas, Complut. Syr. Aeth. ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλȣ τῆς ζωῆς. De *libro* vitae] Latini quique vetuſtiſſimi; de *ligno* vitae. Καὶ τῶν γεγραμμένων] Deeſt ϗ Alex. Codd. fere omnes, Complut. Andreas, Arethas, Copt. Syr. Aeth. Ἐν βιβλίῳ] Iidem Codd. cum Andrea & Aretha ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ. XX. Αμην, ναὶ ἔρχȣ] Deeſt ναὶ Alex. Codd. plurimi, Andreas, Syr. Copt. Aeth. XXI. Κυρίȣ ἡμῶν] Deeſt ἡμῶν Alex. Codd. plures, Andreas, Arethas. Noſtri] Deeſt Cod. vetuſtus Gallicus. Ιησȣ̃ Χριςȣ̃] Deeſt Alex. Chriſti] Deeſt codex Anglicus. Μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. Αμὴν] Deſunt ὑμῶν. Αμὴν. Alex. Cum omnibus vobis, Amen] Deſunt *vobis, Amen.* 3 Codd. Gallici.

REMARKS.

I have been endeavouring to ſhew in the foregoing Remarks, that *our Editor*, upon his own Scheme, cannot give us any thing new, or at leaſt conſiderable above what has already been executed in former Editions; and for the Truth of what I have advanced, I come now to appeal to his *Specimen*; where, tho' one would have expected ſomething *great* and *extraordinary*, equal to the *Pomp* and *Magnificence of his Propoſals*, yet with all his *Hints* and *Conjectures*, his *old Manuſcripts* and *Verſions* he has not been able to produce *one ſingle Reading*, which we do not find long ago exhibited in Dr. *Mills*'s Edition: All the difference is that he has inſerted ſome Readings into the Text, which the Doctor for good Reaſons has left to the Judgment of his Reader at the bottom of his Page.

I ſhall not examine the Merit of each particular Alteration he has made in the Text, it will be ſufficient to take notice onely of one, as a Taſte of his great *Sagacity* and *Judgement*.

In the ſecond Verſe of this Chapter, all the Editions I have yet ſeen, read ἐντεῦθεν ϗ ἐντεῦθεν, which is a *pure Hebraiſm* expreſſed always in that Language by a *Repetition of the ſame Word* מִזֶּה וּמִזֶּה׃ מִפּוֹ וּמִפּוֹ׃ הֵנָּה וְהֵנָּה *hinc & hinc:* we find the Phraſe very often in the Old Teſtament, and conſtantly rendred in the *Greek* by ἐντεῦθεν ϗ ἐντεῦθεν, ἔνθεν ϗ ἔθνεν, ἔνθα ϗ ἔνθα, (*Dan.* xii. 5. *Numb.* xxii. 24. *Ezek.* xl. 34, 37. 1 *Mac.* vi. 45.) and St. *John* himſelf in his Goſpel, (xix. 18.) has likewiſe the very words ἐντεῦθεν ϗ ἐντεῦθεν, without ſo much as a *various Reading* yet obſerved upon it; and 'tis not poſſible to imagine, that being a *Jew* he could uſe any other Phraſe. Yet our Editor not content, like Dr. *Mills*, to obſerve in his Notes the different Reading of this Paſſage in ſome *few Manuſcripts*, has inſtead of the ſecond ἐντεῦθεν boldly advanced ἐκεῖθεν into the Text, fanſying it, I ſuppoſe, to be ſomething more *Elegant*.

As for the *Latin Verſion*, the Reader will eaſily ſee, that it is upon the Matter a *Verbal Tranſlation*, imitating as nearly as poſſible the great Plainneſs and Simplicity of Stile in the *Greek*, which makes it neceſſary in a good Meaſure to fall into the *ſame Order of Words*; but this is no new Obſervation or Diſcovery of our Propoſer's, but what all other Editors have conſtantly obſerved, and applied accordingly to their Purpoſe: St. *Auſtin* calls this Verſion, *Verborum tenacior cum perſpicuitate Sententiæ*.

And Dr. *Mills* ſhews us the Genius and Nature of it through all the ſeveral Books of the New Teſtament, and ſays, that in the *Revelations particularly*, *Verſio admodùm accurata erat*, *ipſiſque textûs Græci Veſtigiis ubique fere κατὰ ϖόδας inſiſtebat*, *niſi cùm ſeries narrationis exigeret*, *ut mutarenter verborum tempora*. Proleg. Which may ſuggeſt one Reaſon, amongſt others which are obvious, why *this Chapter* was made choice of for *the Specimen*; but that *the Order of Words of the Greek* is not *conſtantly* and *unalterably* obſerved in the *Latin*, appears from many Inſtances in this Chapter, as I have above remarked; which is ſufficient to overthrow our Author's Hypotheſis,

After all, I will not pretend to deny, that our Author may poſſibly have met with and collated ſome *few Manuſcripts*, which Dr. *Mills* had not heard or made uſe of; but what Reaſon or Pretence can this give him for ſuch a Triumph and Inſult over all the Editors before him?

He has already told us, *(Remarks on Free-thinkers*. page 69.*) That with all the Thirty Thouſand various Readings, no one Article of Faith or even moral Precept is either loſt or perverted in them, chuſe as aukwardly as you can, chuſe the worſt by deſign out of the whole lump*: How ridiculous is it then to make ſuch a pother about the diſcovery of *a few more inſignificant ones*, as if the *Cauſe of Religion*, and the Support of the *Chriſtian Church* depended upon it?

He may indeed, if he pleaſes, like his *Friend Dr. Kuſter*, publiſh *a new Edition of Dr. Mills*'s *Work*, with the additional Readings he has picked up (if any ſuch there be) and *the Latin Verſion* beſides; but while he pretends to give us a *new Original Edition of his own*, upon the *Scheme* and *Plan of theſe Propoſals*, he will be found, I am apt to think, at laſt to have acted *the Plagiary* rather than the *Critick*.

I might properly enough obſerve the many *Blunders* and *Erratas of the Preſs*, (as remarkable in *this Specimen* as in the very worſt of our *printed Editions*) to ſhew that there is no kind of *Inaccuracy* but what may juſtly be charged upon it; but the Reader is, I believe, already ſufficiently convinced with the *Author of St. James*'s *Poſt*, that thoſe *Propoſals are a moſt curious Piece*, ſince ſo much *Vanity*, *Pedantry*, *Blunder*, and *Self-Contradiction* were hardly ever found together before within the compaſs of one ſingle Sheet.

SOME FARTHER

REMARKS,

PARAGRAPH by PARAGRAPH,

UPON

PROPOSALS

Lately publiſhed for

A New EDITION

OF A

Greek and *Latin* *Teſtament*,

BY

RICHARD BENTLEY,

CONTAINING

A full Anſwer to the Editor's late Defence of his ſaid PROPOSALS, as well as to all his Objections there made againſt my former REMARKS.

> *Imperitiam tuam nemo poteſt fortiùs accuſare, quam Tu ipſe dum ſcribis.* Hieron.
>
> ——*Occupatus ille eruditione ſecularium literarum ſcripturas omninò ſanctas ignoraverit*; *& nemo poſſit, quamvis eloquens, de eo benè diſputare, quod neſciat.* Ibid.

THE

PREFACE.

AS *ſoon as* my Remarks *were publiſhed, finding that I was threatned with an* Anſwer, *I began, one may imagine, to be in no ſmall Pain for my ſelf*; *eſpecially when I recollected, that it was* an old Trick with our good Chriſtian Editor, to talk weakly often out of Deſign, [*a*] to diſſemble his Strength, *and* keep his Arguments out of Sight, on purpoſe to draw ſome forward, wrangling Loggerhead into his Net, and ſo make a little Mirth and Sport with him for the Entertainment of the Learned. *I could not help fancying, that I had* ſwallowed the Bait, *and was certainly caught in one of* his Critical Traps; *I began to reflect that* his Propoſals *could hardly be ſo* weak, *as they appeared, without* ſome Trick, *ſome* Deſign *at the bottom*; *and that as ſhallow as I thought them, they might probably be found at laſt to be* plena ſenſibus, * full of deep, latent, recondite Senſes, *ſuch as my poor Capacity could not fathom*; *and that I was now to be made an Example of, for a Warning to all* future Nibblers *at the Fame and Learning of this* Great Man.

* p. 22.

But his anſwer *no ſooner appeared, than all my Fears were at an End*; *for I preſently found, that I had put him* paſt his joking, *and that inſtead of* diverting himſelf and his Brother Critics *at my Expence*, the Jeſt *was much more likely to* end upon himſelf: *For tho'* his Title *promiſed us a* full Anſwer to my Remarks, *yet I obſerved, that he had paſſed over many* material ones, *without* any Anſwer *at all*; *and that where he had exerted all his Skill and Pains, his Reaſoning was* ſo evaſive, ſo prevaricating, *and* ſo little to the Purpoſe, *as to to give me onely a farther Opportunity of demonſtrat-*

[*a*] Non rarò etiam data operâ brevior contractiorque fui, conſultò viribus parcens, & quæ in promptu mihi erant, opes diſſimulans; ut ſtolidi & ad depugnandum parati ſe in laqueos inopinantes induerent, riſum jocumque naſutioribus daturi, Vid. Bentl. Not. in Horat.

ing the two things I had undertaken, viz. *his great Ignorance of* Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity, *and the* main Points *in Diſpute*; *as well as his* manifeſt Incapacity *for the Work now upon his Hands*; an Edition of the New Teſtament.

But what was the moſt ſurprizing in this extraordinary Piece *of his, was to find it to be in Fact a* moſt virulent and malicious Libel *upon Dr.* Colbatch, *a* Reverend *and* Learned *Member of his College, on Pretence of his being the* Author of the Remarks; *tho' he could not poſſibly be ignorant* long before *his Book was publiſhed, that this* worthy Gentleman *was perfectly unconcerned in the Controverſy*; *wholly out of the Queſtion*; *and had not any Share or Part at all in* adviſing *or* aſſiſting *me on the Occaſion. For I no ſooner heard, that ſome of my Friends were ſuſpected by him, but to prevent any Inconvenience which might befal ſuch of them as were more immediately under his Power, I freely owned my ſelf the* ſole Author, *gave Commiſſion to my Acquaintance to make no Secret of it any where*; *and was informed, at different times, by ſeveral of them, that they had aſſured ſome of* his principal Friends *and* Confidents *of the* Truth *and* Certainty *of it, to their own Knowledge. Dr.* Colbatch *on the other hand, did from the beginning* (as he afterwards thought fit to declare by a printed Advertiſement) *conſtantly* diſclaim *the Imputation in ſuch a* publick *and* open Manner, *as muſt of Neceſſity come to* the Knowledge of our Editor.

But tho' he knew very well the true Author, *ye he was reſolved to diſſemble it, for the* double Pleaſure *it would give him of* abuſing Dr. Colbatch, *and ſhewing his* Contempt of me. *He has long made it his Buſineſs to repreſent* me *every where as a* worthleſs, inſignificant Mortal; the Muſical Conyers; † the Publiſher of other Mens Labours. *He began the* Controverſy in the College, *by writing a moſt* falſe and ſcandalous Libel *upon* me by Name, *as well as all the* other Fellows *of the Society who were* Petitioners *againſt him to the* late Biſhop of Ely. *And to have owned* me *for the* Author of Remarks, *which the World had received with Approbation, would have been little better than giving himſelf* the Lie; *to own, that I could produce any thing* in the Way of Learning

† p. 11. 36.

ing *conſiderable enough to* merit an Anſwer *from him, was a* Mortification too ſevere *for him to ſubmit to.*

As to the Merit *of his Performance*; *nothing ſure was ever contrived or conducted* ſo injudiciouſly. *He repreſents* my Remarks * *as the Product of meer* Spleen and Envy; *yet gives me* * p. 10. *the onely Satisfaction a* ſplenetic Writer *could wiſh, of ſeeing that they have* ſtung him *to the quick, and* galled him *moſt effectually. He would have them looked upon as* trifling *and* contemptible; † *yet* † p. 44. *will needs have them written by* a Perſon eminent and diſtinguiſhed in the Univerſity *for his* Learning. *His Buſineſs is to ſhew what* ſingular Talents *he has for* an Editor of the New Teſtament; *yet he has convinced us by his* manner of Writing, *that he has never* read with any Effect, *or* ſtudied with any Care the very Books *he pretends to publiſh.*

Some People have obſerved, that the onely Way of entering into the true Spirit and Sentiments *of an Author, is to put our ſelves,* in Imagination *at leaſt, into the* very Circumſtances *he was in at the Time of his Writing. But* our Editor *is ſo far from accommodating himſelf to the* Character and Condition of an Apoſtle; *ſo far from compoſing his Mind to that* Charity, Meekneſs *and* Benevolence, *which flows in every Expreſſion* of the Goſpel, *that he has been giving us a* Specimen *onely, how well he could imitate and publiſh* Philippics; *and that the beſt* Heathen Orator *of them all is not to be compared with him, for the* true Virulence and Rancour of his Invectives.

A Cauſe, ſupported with ſo much Paſſion *and* Scandal, *will always be ſuſpected by Men of Senſe and Candour*; Reaſon *and* Truth *could never raiſe* ſuch Tempeſts *in the Breaſt, but give* an Eaſineſs *always and* Complacency *to the Mind*; *'tis the* Conſciouſneſs *of being in the wrong, and the* Shame *of being detected that* ruffle *and* diſorder it.

Ἀπορία λόγων ἐϖὶ τὸ λοιδορεῖν τρέπεται. *Euſeb.*

'Tis, as Euſebius *obſerves, pure* want of Argument *that ſets him*

thus a railing; *'tis the* Rage of a foil'd and baffled Critic; *the* Fury *of an* old Tyrant in Letters, *to find, after a Reign of* thirty Years, his Title *at laſt diſputed, and* his Ignorance *expoſed.*

I have avoided to take any Notice, in the following Remarks, of the wretched Scandal *and* Scurrility, *which* crowd his Pages to the Offence of all good Perſons; *I could eaſily have forgiven any* Turns of Wit *or* Raillery *ariſing from the Subject, however* ſevere *upon me, or however* aukwardly *attempted by him; but for the* ſenſeleſs, unpointed Ribaldry *which every Paragraph of his is filled with; 'tis enough for me to leave it to that* univerſal Contempt, *which I'm ſenſible it has met with; were I capable of returning it* in kind, *I could deſpiſe* my ſelf, *I aſſure him, much more heartily than he does. But we may hope however to reap from it* one Satisfaction, *that it will probably oblige the* worthy Gentleman *ſo ſcandalouſly injured by it, to give* the Publick *ſome Account of* his own *and* our Editor's *Conduct in the* preſent Differences of the College; *it is now in a manner become* neceſſary *for him to publiſh ſome* Apology *for himſelf, and not to ſuffer* his Perſon and Character *to be expoſed to the World under ſuch* falſe *and* deteſtable Colours *as* our Editor *has painted them in.*

And leſt I ſhould again be the unhappy Inſtrument *of drawing ſo much* Trouble *and* Injury *upon* any other Friend *of mine; I have here* ſet my Name *to my preſent Performance, owning* my ſelf *to be wholly anſwerable for every thing contained in it; and being deſirous to give* our Editor *all the Satisfaction I am able, am content to declare my ſelf in as* ample Manner and Form, *as his* own Lawyers *had drawn up for me on* another Occaſion; *that I am the* ſole Collector, Compoſer *and* Author of every Part, Paragraph *and* Sentence *in the following Book.*

There's one thing which I find neceſſary to recommend to the Reader, before I cloſe this Preface; that is, to obſerve and diſtinguiſh the true State of the Queſtion, *between* our Editor *and* my ſelf, *as far as relates to St.* Jerom *and* the Order of Words. *He lays much Streſs every where upon the* cloſe Adherence *of the* old Latin Verſions to the Order of Words *of the Original; and many,* *I am ſenſible, for want of Attention, have been deceived by it into an Opinion of the Juſtneſs and Truth of his Reaſoning, as if it were confirmed by Fact and Experiment. Whereas all this is really nothing at all to his Purpoſe, nor in any Manner affects the preſent Controverſy; I have already allowed it in my* former Remarks, *and ſhall again obſerve in the* following ones *how moſt of our* Prior Editors *have long ſince taken notice of it, and made all the Uſe, that can be drawn from it in their* ſeveral Editions. *The* ſingle Point *in Diſpute as to this Caſe, is how far St.* Jerom *contributed to this Agreement in* Words and Order of Words *between the* Latin *and* Greek *of the* New Teſtament. *He maintains, that St.* Jerom, *believing the* Order of Words to be myſterious, *confined himſelf* religiouſly *to the Obſervance of it, in* his Tranſlations of Scripture, *and conſequently in his Caſtigation of the* Old Vulgate, *took care to adapt and reduce it, as much as he could,* to this very Order. *This is all that is* new *in his preſent Scheme; this he lays down as the* ſole Reaſon *and* Foundation *of his intended* Edition; *and this is the* onely Notion *which I have endeavoured to expoſe; if I have ſucceeded in it, the Reader muſt own, that I have performed what I had undertaken, and have ſhewn this* great Deſign of his *to be at leaſt very ill grounded, and* raſhly *and* injudiciouſly *undertaken.*

Leſt any one ſhould think that I have been too ſevere, *in my* Reflections *upon the* Stile *and* Language of our Editor, *I thought it neceſſary to ſubjoin here a* Specimen *of it; where I have taken no other Liberty with* his Words, *than that of collecting and ranging them into ſome kind of Order.*

An Engliſh Cabbage-head, p. 37.

An Inſect, a Worm, a Maggot, Book-Vermin; the Venom of ſuch Vermin, p. 10, 36.

The Animal; a ſharp-ſighted Mole; a gnawing Rat; a ſnarling Dog; a roaring Lion in Libya *with long Ears*, p. 11, 10, 18, 28, 11.

The Man with a thick Hide and ſolid Forehead; Suffenus; Zoilus, Margites, Timon, *Miſanthrope, ſwarthy* Timon, *hard-fac'd* Timon, *grinning* Zoilus, *of Intellect as dark as his Countenance;* p. 13, 9, 25, 33, 22, 27, 30.

An ignorant Thief; *a Wretch of native Stupidity*; *of low Talents and vicious Taſte*; *ſupercilious Pedant*; *caſuiſtick Drudge*; *plodding Pupil of* Eſcobar; *of ſuperficial Learning and profound Ignorance*; *a Fool labouring to be witty*; *of Fog and Dulneſs*; *of ſubſtantial Stupidity*; *of Stupour and Inſenſibility beyond the famous* Tom Coryat, p. 30, 25, 31, 42, 22, 29, 13, 37, 23, 33, 36.

A Mountebank of habitual Grimace, who for many Years has daily acted a Grimace; *aiming at aukward Ridicule*; *with Eyes, Muſcles and Shoulders wrought into a ſolemn Poſture of Gravity*, p. 43, 31, 10, 37, 10.

Of moſt tenacious and ſordid Avarice, p. 38.

Lunatick Timon; *crazy-headed Cenſor*; *in a dark Room*; *under the Repute of Crazineſs and Madneſs*; *falling into raving Fits and ſudden Extravagance under the Influence of the Moon*; *a Scribbler out of the dark*; *mad at the great Encouragement of the Propoſals, he raged, ſtormed, and took his deadly Pen in Hand*, p. 34, 10, 39, 32, 38, 24, 39.

Of Rancour and Malice implacable; *of Spleen and Envy a ſpightful Examiner*; *whoſe Life and Studies have been ſpent in libelling and defaming*; *ſquabbling in the College to keep up his Spirits*; *a Libeller of the Government*; *guilty of* Scandalum Magnatum; *old Conſcience, good Affidavit-Man, yet left his Friend* Conyers *in peril of the Pillory*; *broaching always meer Knavery, with a Preface about his Conſcience*; *a moſt impudent Liar*; *a pious Calumniator*; *ungrateful*; *malignant*; *virulent*; *deteſtable*, p. 43, 39, 31, 36, 39, 11, 14, 35, 10, 21, 29, 14.

Legion, extending his wide Jaws, and ſmiling horrible like Satan, p. 9, 40.

And yet it is notorious to the whole Univerſity, that the Gentleman, *whoſe Picture is here deſigned by our* Editor, *is as* unlike *and* contrary *to it in* every Circumſtance of his Character, *as any Man living*; *being a Perſon of a* ſtudious, retired *and* exemplary Life; *of a* Vertue never reproached, *except with* too great a Severity; *and of* ſingular Talents and Abilities *to adorn the* honourable Poſt, *he now fills amongſt us*; *the* Profeſſorſhip of Caſuiſtical Divinity.

CAMBRIDGE, Jan. 20.

F*Inding my ſelf to be treated after a moſt barbarous manner in a virulent Libel, which bears the Title of* Dr. Bentley's Propoſals, with a full Anſwer, *&c. upon Pretence of my being the Author of* The Remarks upon the Propoſals lately publiſhed by Richard Bentley, *&c. I think it neceſſary upon ſeveral Accounts to declare as follows,* viz.

That I am not the Author of thoſe Remarks, *nor any part of them, and that they were undertaken and written without my Aſſiſtance or Knowledge.*

That R. B. *certainly knew, or eaſily might have known, that they were written by the Reverend and Learned Dr.* MIDDLETON, *who had own'd them to ſeveral of his Friends, by whoſe means he verily believes, that* R. B. *was inform'd that he alone was the Author. For my own part, preſently after the* Remarks *were publiſh'd, I took all Occaſions to declare as above, being obliged in Juſtice ſo to do, leſt my Silence might in ſome meaſure contribute to deprive my worthy Friend of the Honour due for ſo excellent a Performance; nor do I queſtion but that* R. B. *before he began to write his Libel, had been acquainted with what I ſaid on thoſe Occaſions.*

That thoſe foul Aſperſions, which are caſt upon me in almoſt every Page, are as falſe in Fact, as they are apparently malicious; which is notorious to all who know me, and to none more than R. B. *himſelf.*

That I never wrote any Libels againſt the Government, the College, or the Maſter, as he falſly aſſerts.

I never wrote any thing at all relating to the Government, or publiſh'd any thing concerning the College, or the Maſter, except a Commemoration Sermon in Dec. 1717, *which the Maſter pretended to approve of, giving it under his Hand that he would ſubſcribe to every Word of it. As to other matters relating to either, I have hitherto thought them fit only for the Cognizance of a Viſitor.*

JOHN COLBATCH, D. D. Senior Fellow of *Trinity* College,
and Caſuiſtical Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of
Cambridge.

CAMBRIDGE.

At a Meeting of the Vice-Chancellor *and* Heads, *Feb.* 27. 1720-21.

WHereas *the Reverend* John Colbatch, *D. D. and Caſuiſtical Profeſſor of this Univerſity, hath made Complaint to us of a Book lately publiſhed, annexed to* Propoſals for printing a new Edition of the Greek Teſtament, *&c. and call'd,* A full Anſwer to all the Remarks of a late Pamphleteer, by a Member of Trinity College, *ſubſcribed* J. E. *wherein the ſaid* John Colbatch *conceives himſelf to be highly injured, as being repreſented under the moſt reproachful and infamous Characters, and hath therefore applied to us for Redreſs. We the* Vice-Chancellor *and* Heads *of Colleges, whoſe Names are underwritten, having peruſed the ſaid Book, do find that the ſaid Dr.* Colbatch *had juſt Ground of Complaint, it appearing to us, that he is therein deſcribed under very odious and ignominious Characters, and do declare and pronounce the ſaid Book to be a moſt virulent and ſcandalous* Libel; *highly injurious to the ſaid Dr.* Colbatch, *contrary to good Manners, and a notorious Violation of the Statutes and Diſcipline of this Univerſity. And as ſoon as the Author of the ſaid* Libel *can be diſcovered, we reſolve to do Juſtice to the ſaid Dr.* Colbatch, *by inflicting ſuch Cenſure upon the Offender, as the Statutes of this Univerſity in that Caſe do appoint.*

Tho. Croſſe, *Vice-Chancellor.*
John Covel.
C. Aſhton.
Bardſey Fiſher.
Edw. Lany.
R. Jenkin.
Wm. Grigg.
D. Waterland.
Wm. Savage.

SOME FARTHER

REMARKS,

PARAGRAPH by PARAGRAPH,

UPON

PROPOSALS, &c.

OUR Editor begins his *diſmal Story*, by acquainting us, that *the Author of the Remarks, at the firſt publiſhing, might have been called Legion* *; this we muſt own to * p. 9. be ſetting out like *an Editor of the New Teſtament*, with a *Scripture Simile* in his Mouth; but how does he make it out? Why, becauſe *every one*, he ſays, *of the Univerſity that was thought to have Conceitedneſs and Malice enough to write it, was ſuſpected to be the Author*. The Truth is, that he and his Friends did *me* and *my Remarks* the Honour to impute them to many Perſons of *allowed Learning and Abilities*; and tho' it ſoon appeared, that not *one of thoſe*, they were pleaſed to ſuſpect, had the leaſt Hand or Share *in the Guilt*, yet the *very ſuſpicion*, it ſeems, was enough to make them odious; they were capable of doing it, and therefore *our Editor* hates them, and the Opportunity muſt not be loſt of branding them here with the Characters of *conceited* and *malicious*.

But the Author's Party is diſcovered, he tells us, *in his Title-page, where our Maſter is named plain* Richard Bentley, *without the Honour of his Degree* *. This indeed is a Charge which * p. 9. I cannot

I cannot deny to be true; my *very Title page* diſcovers that I belong to an *Univerſity*, which has *deprived him of his Degrees*; and might very juſtly have *deprived me too*, if I ſhould pretend to beſtow *Titles*, which ſhe has thought fit *to take away*; but *our Editor* knows full well that he has no Right or Claim to the *Stile of Doctor*; and whenever he ſpeaks or acts in his own Perſon, dare not ſo much as aſſume it himſelf; in the *Title of his own Propoſals*, we have no more than *Edidit Richardus Bentleius*; and I, who am onely tranſlating him, ſay, *publiſhed by Richard Bentley*; pray where's the Difference? In an *Information* drawn up and proſecuted by himſelf, for a *late Pamphlet* againſt him, *the Charge* is for vilifying the Reputation of *one Richard Bentley*; the calling himſelf Doctor, might, he knows, have been fatal to his Cauſe, and have endanger'd a *Nonſuit*; therefore, *Good Maſter Richard*, be not for once ſo ceremonious, nor ſtand ſo much upon Compliments with *your old Friend Conyers* †. But what is the moſt provoking to him is, that I will not allow him to have either *Talents* or *Materials* adequate to the Work he has undertaken; this I muſt declare to be my Opinion, and as I am well convinc'd of it my ſelf, do not queſtion, before I have done with him, but to convince the World of it too; but if this be poſſible, what an unhappy Conſequence does he neceſſarily faſten upon it? For then, ſays he, * *No body muſt any longer confide or be ſecure in his good Name; a Worm, a Maggot can demoliſh it in a trice, and the higheſt Reputation in Letters acquired by repeated Proofs, for the ſpace of above thirty Years is in one Day to be blaſted by an Inſect.*

† p. 35.

* p. 10.

Here we ſee what it was that made him ſo *confident*, ſo *ſecure* of impoſing upon the World, *viz. his high Reputation in Letters*; this, he imagined, would have made us receive, with a ſlaviſh implicit Applauſe, whatever he had pleaſed to propound to us; he did not doubt, but *his over-bearing Name* would oblige us to Charge rather upon *our own* Ignorance, than that of ſo *learned an Editor*, the *apparent Folly and Blunder of his Propoſals*; or would have terrified us at leaſt, from entring the Liſts with ſo *renowned and formidable a Champion*; it is this Aſſurance, we ſee, that a great part of his Reaſoning chiefly turns upon; *Have not I had the higheſt Reputation in Letters? How than can I want Talents or Materials? Has not my Life been ſpent in Critical Obſervations? How then can a crazy-headed Cenſor* * *pretend to teach me Latin?* This he reckons ſo concluſive, that it is the onely Anſwer he has given to the Charge of *Impropriety and falſe Latin*, which I had made to his *Title-page*; but he is not the onely Man I could name, who has acquired *a Reputation in Learning* much ſuperior *to his Merit*, and has paſſed for a *wondrous Critick* in all the Languages, without being able to write *any one* of them with Taſte or Correctneſs. * p. 10.

In the Cloſe of his Introduction he charges me with having been *the Publiſher of ſeveral Libels written by Dr.* Colbatch *againſt the Maſter* †, *the College, and the very Government*; and yet I declare, that I never yet publiſhed any thing in my Life that was not ſtrictly and entirely of my own compoſing, nor any thing at all, that ever related to, or *reflected in any Manner upon the Government*; I did indeed in a late Pamphlet repreſent the *juſt Complaints of the Fellows of his College*, (*my old Friends and Fellow-Sufferers*) againſt his *oppreſſive Government*; for which he is now proſecuting me by way of *Information in the King's Bench*; but tho' he *flies to the Law* himſelf, as an *injur'd, libell'd* Perſon, yet he makes no Scruple, we ſee, *to libel me and others too* as much as he pleaſes, and with a Modeſty peculiar to himſelf *prejudges the very Cauſe* now depending, and *condemns me even* * *to the Pillory.* † p. 11. * p. 35.

And tho' he is pleaſed to reflect upon Dr. *Colbatch*, for having *left me* † *in the Lurch*; I have yet the Satisfaction to aſſure him, that I am provided with ſuch *Affidavits* both from the *Doctor and ſeveral others*, as will be ſufficient, tho' not perhaps *to juſtify me to the Law (which I did not at all underſtand, nor ever deſigned to offend)* yet to *juſtify* me however to the World from the *leaſt Suſpicion* of having done him any Injury. † ibid.

Paragraph

Paragraph the Firſt.

The Author of this Edition, obſerving that the Printed Copies of the New Teſtament, both of the Original Greek and Antient vulgar Latin, were taken from Manuſcripts of no great Antiquity, ſuch as the firſt Editors could then procure; and that now by God's Providence there are MSS. in Europe, *(acceſſible, tho' with great Charge) above a thouſand Years old in both Languages; believes he may do good Service to common Chriſtianity, if he publiſhes a New Edition of the* Greek *and* Latin, *not according to the recent and interpolated Copies, but as repreſented in the moſt ancient and venerable MSS. in Greek and Roman Capital Letters.*

REMARKS.

I ſhall not trouble the Reader with a long Repetition of what I have offered in my *Remarks* in Anſwer *to this Paragraph*; it will be ſufficient to inform him, that thinking it my Duty to vindicate in ſome Meaſure *the Authority of our printed Scripture*, *ſo roundly ſtruck at by our Editor*, and to defend the Characters of our *former Editors*, from the *vile Inſinuations*, here thrown out upon them, I have ſhewn that ſeveral of them were Men of the *greateſt Learning and Abilities* for a Work of this Nature, that all the *Countries of Chriſtendom* could furniſh; and that they had all the Aſſiſtance and Encouragement in the Execution of it, which the Power and Munificence of *Princes*, *Popes* and *Cardinals* could ſupply them with; that they were ſo far from taking up, or being content with *ſuch Manuſcripts as they happened to have at hand*, or had *pick'd up by chance*, or ſuch as they could *eaſily and haſtily get together*; that it was the Buſineſs and Labour of their Lives to ſearch out every thing that was *curious* and *rare* in that Kind, or could be uſeful to their Purpoſe in any Part of the World; that we have Accounts of many Manuſcripts procured for their Service with great *Difficulty* and *Expence* from *different Regions*, *diſtant Countries*, *remote Iſlands*; that in Fact, *ſeveral of the Manuſcripts* they made uſe of, are allowed by all Judges to be as *ancient and correct* as any now known in the World; that *their Editions* formed upon *theſe Manuſcripts* have, ever ſince their Publication, been highly valued and eſteemed by all Men of Senſe and Learning, as generally *accurate and correct*, and by none more than *our Editor himſelf*, when he had no *private Views* or *Intereſts* to ſerve by decrying them.

And now, can any thing be a more full or direct Anſwer than this? He aſſures us, *that the Manuſcripts of our printed Copies of the New Teſtament are of no great Antiquity*; I have proved them *to be of the greateſt*; he ſays, *that there are now MSS. in* Europe, *acceſſible, tho' with great Charge, above a thouſand Year old*; and I have ſhewn, that *our Editors had actually Acceſs* to ſeveral of *that Age*; and that no longer ago than fourteen Years, *all the Copies* known and famous in *Europe* were collated *for the Uſe of Dr.* Mill; he ſays, *that his MSS. are written in Greek and Roman Capital Letters*; a certain Characteriſtic of true Antiquity; and juſt ſo, ſay I, *are ſeveral of the Copies* of every *other Editor* I have mentioned.

This, I thought, was ſufficient to prove the *Injuſtice* and *Barbarity* of his Treatment of all *former Editors*; Perſons to whom the *Chriſtian World* will always have the higheſt Obligation, and to whom no Man in it can be more particularly obliged *than himſelf*, if he is *ſincere* and *in earneſt* in the deſign of his Edition.

I ſhall proceed therefore to conſider what he has to ſay in Juſtification of himſelf, *in this Anſwer of his*, which I am now examining; all which when laid together is *in Subſtance* and *Effect* juſt what follows, *viz.*

That let us ſay what we will of *our prior Editors*, they are not however to be named with the *mighty Bentley*; the Men might be paſſable enough for the *Age they lived in*, but we muſt not think to compare them to the *enlightened Criticks* of

theſe Times, to the ὅιοι νῦν βροτόι εἰσιν. For the World is now
* p. 13. grown *older and wiſer,* * *has now advanc'd two whole Centuries*
in Age, ſince the Date of the Complutenſian *and* Eraſmus's
Edition, and as much within thirty Years ſince that of Rob. Ste-
† p. 26. phens, that they, poor Men, † did not know *how to uſe the*
very Manuſcripts they had in their Hands; for *Stephens was a*
* p. 12. *meer* * *Printer*; Mill *an ignorant* † *Blunderer*; and for *Cardinal*
† p. 18, 26, 33. Ximenes's *Purſe,* * *what's that to our Maſter? Four Millions*
* p. 15. *of Crowns would not buy the MSS. that he has collated for his*
Edition.

And as for the Manuſcripts themſelves, which they made
† p. 12. uſe of, he tells us, *the plain Fact*; † *that older and better are*
now to be had, than former Editors could come at; *that in thoſe*
* p. 13. *Days,* * *when no better were ſeen, they gave the Titles of Anci-*
ent and Venerable to ſuch as are now ſcarce reckon'd in the ſecond
* p. 33, 34. *or third Rate*; that the beſt Editor of them all * *made uſe of*
ſuch ſcrubb MSS. ſuch ſcoundril Copies, as our Maſter would ſcorn
even to look into; and that therefore upon the whole, conſider-
ing the great *Abilities* and *Advantages* he is poſſeſſed of, above
† p. 11. all who went before him; we muſt *be forced to own that* † *he*
has expreſſed himſelf in the modeſteſt, tendereſt, and moſt inno-
cent Words in the World, without the ſmalleſt Reproach or Re-
flection upon the prior Editors.

This is the Sum and Subſtance of our Maſter's Apology, and the Reader will excuſe me, I dare ſay, from giving him or my ſelf the Trouble of *a ſerious Anſwer* to it, or of adding any thing more to what I have ſaid *ſo fully* on this Occaſion in my *Remarks*; however, ſince he inſiſts ſtill upon his Privilege, of trampling at pleaſure upon the *great and learned* Men of all Ages, he muſt excuſe me, if I examine likewiſe, with *no ſmall Freedom,* what Right and Title he has to aſſume *ſuch a Power* to himſelf, and what *Truth* and *Reality* there is in this Prentence of his to ſuch *ſuperior Talents* and *Materials*: But becauſe the Conſideration of his *Talents* may fall more properly under our Notice in ſome other Parts of *theſe Remarks,* I ſhall at preſent onely enquire into the *true ſtate of his Materials*, his *older and better Manuſcripts*, which he makes ſuch a Noiſe about.

The firſt Account I have met with *of his Manuſcripts* is in a *printed Letter of his*, upon the Subject of his Edition, *dated Trin. Coll. Jan.* 1. 1716-17, where we are informed by him, that he *makes uſe of no Manuſcripts, but thoſe of a thouſand Years old, or above; of which ſort he had got at that Time twenty together in his Study, which made up, one with another, twenty thouſand Years* [a].

Now before we go any farther, if he will but condeſcend to prove the Truth of this *ſingle Fact*, and make it fairly appear to the World, that he ever was in Poſſeſſion of *ſuch a Number of Manuſcripts at once*, and *of ſuch Antiquity* as is here pretended, I promiſe to give up the Cauſe, and to own him as *accompliſhed an Editor as he pleaſes:* but I have ſeen ſo much of the Hiſtory and preſent State of the *Manuſcripts of the New Teſtament*, as to know it to be impoſſible for *any Man* or *any Library* to ſhew *ſo great a Number of ſuch old ones*, at any one time in their Poſſeſſion.

Mr. Martin *of* Utrecht, [b] ſpeaking upon the Subject of *this very Letter*, ſays, that *our Editor is not a little indebted to his good Fortune for having found twenty Manuſcripts well told, which are of a thouſand Years ago, or above; it being one of the moſt extraordinary Diſcoveries in this kind of Literature, that has been made in our Days.* And in another Place, *The Point will be,* ſays he, *whether theſe Manuſcripts lately diſcovered be really as old as Dr.* Bentley *takes them to be; for we are not ignorant how difficult it is, not to ſay impoſſible, to paſs always in theſe Caſes a certain Judgment and ſecure from all Doubt.*

Monſieur *Simon* in his *Critical Hiſtory of the New Teſtament* [c] gives us a pleaſant Account of *juſt ſuch and Editor as this of*

---

[a] *Vid.* Two Letters to Dr. *Bentley*, and the Doctor's Anſwer, *Lond.* 1717.

[b] *Martin*'s Defence of his Diſſertation in *Engliſh*, p. 13. *it.* p. 16.

[c] Tom. 1. p. 346.

ours, Father Amelote; who, in the *Preface of his* French *Tranſlation of the New Taſtament*, informs the World, *that he made an exact Search for all the Manuſcripts of Chriſtendom, of above a thouſand Years old, and had procured Collations of them all; that he had got above twenty out of* France; *all thoſe of the* Vatican, *and the famous Libraries of* Italy; *ſixteen from* Spain, *without reckoning thoſe of Cardinal* Ximenes; *all thoſe of* England *and the Northern Countries; many from the heart of* Greece; *with thoſe that the Ancient Fathers made uſe of.*

One would imagine, ſays Monſieur *Simon, upon reading this Paſſage, that this Father had at this Time in his Hands all the Copies he ſpeaks of, or at leaſt the Collations of them; yet all this long Diſcourſe*, ſays he, *is but a mere flouriſh of Rhetorick;* [b] *to raiſe and ennoble the Subject he is treating of; for being adviſed by a Friend (who ſhewed him at the ſame time all his various Readings in Print) to leave out of his Preface, this ſtrange Rant about his Manuſcripts, he made no other Anſwer, than that the Argument he was handling, made it neceſſary for him to expreſs himſelf, after a noble ſublime manner, to make the ſtronger Impreſſion upon the Minds of his Readers.*

And having Occaſion to mention *this ſame Editor* again in another Place, [c] he tells us, *that the great Number of Manuſcripts of twelve and thirteen hundred Years, which he pretended to have collected, exiſted onely in his Imagination*, and *that he could not be ſincere, becauſe he had not produced one ſingle various Reading, which had not been known and printed before in other Editions.*

The Caſe is juſt the ſame with *our Engliſh Amelote*, for

---

[a] Mais tout ce long Diſcours n'eſt qu'une figure de Rhetorique, dont il ſe ſert pour, &c. Il ne fit point d'autre reponſe la deſſus a ſon Confrere, qui luy montra en meme tems ces diverſes leçons imprimees, ſi non que la matiere, dont il parloit, demandoit qu'il s'explicat d'une maniere noble, pour faire plus d'impreſſion dans l'eſprit, &c. *ibid.*

[b] Tom. 2. p. 370. Ce grand nombre de MSS. qu'il aſſure avoir douze & treize cens ans, n'ont etè que dans ſon imagination.

Il ne nous a donne aucunes diverſités de leçon, qui ne fuſſent dêjà imprimees *ibid.*

when we come a little cloſer to him, *the twenty old Manuſcripts*, which he has juſt before given us an Account of, *ſhrink at once * into eight*; and follow him ſtill a little farther, and he is forced again to own, that even *of theſe eight*, *there are onely four*, *which † had not been collated and made uſe of by Dr.* Mill. * p. 13. † p. 14.

And now we are come to a full Diſcovery of the whole Strength of our Editor, *viz. four Manuſcripts*; theſe are *all the Forces* he is Maſter of, to maintain *the War* he has declared againſt all *former Editors*; with *theſe four* it is, that he has promiſed to work ſuch Wonders; to produce the *very Teſtament read at the Council* [*a*] *of* Nice, and even to go a Century higher and *retrieve the very Exemplar of* Origen.

The whole Number of *Greek Manuſcripts of the Old and New Teſtament*, now known in *Europe*, amounts, as 'tis ſuppoſed, [*b*] to about *four hundred*; and there's hardly *one* amongſt them all, which has not been collated and made uſe of in ſome or other of our *printed Editions*; and yet by our *Maſter's bluſtering* one would imagine the Caſe to be *juſt the Reverſe* between *him* and the *former Editors*; and that *all of them* together had never ſeen *more* than *his four*; whilſt *he* was in Poſſeſſion *of their four hundred.*

Dr. *Kuſter* by a very diligent Search found out *twelve Manuſcripts*, which had eſcaped Dr. *Mill*'s *Enquiry*; and tho' he was willing enough to make *the beſt Penny* he could of them, yet all he could do, was to publiſh again Dr. *Mill*'s *Teſtament* in *Holland*, with the *Additional Readings* he had gather'd; and he thought, I dare ſay, that he had diſpoſed of them to good Advantage.

But our Editor, with no more than his *four Copies*, will be content with nothing leſs than a *new Original Edition of his own*, and ſuch an one too, as is to make all others whatſoever *uſeleſs* and *contemptible*; he ought however, methinks, to oblige

---

[*a*] *Vid.* the two printed Letters, *&c.* [*b*] *Vid.* Le Long. Bibliotheca ſacra. *Paris.*

his Subſcribers with a *more particular and ſatisfactory* Account of *the four Manuſcripts* he pretends to; whether, *tho' never uſed by Dr.* Mill, they were not ſtill *collated by Dr.* Kuſter; whether *any one of them*, or *all together*, *make out the whole New Teſtament:* 'Tis a great Rarity to find any *one of Value* which contains *above a Part of it*, and *our Editor* tells us himſelf, [*] *that there are very few good ones, nay not ſo much as one of any* [†] *Antiquity*, *beſides the* Alexandrine, *which comprehends the whole*; ſo that whenever he thinks fit to anſwer *theſe Queries*, his *little Stock* will probably *once more* be reduced *to half*, nay, he will be left, I am almoſt confident, with nothing more than *ſome piece onely of the New Teſtament in Manuſcript*.

But *his Copies*, I know, are like the *Sybil's Books*, while we *leſſen* their Number, we ſtill *enhance* their Value; and if we leave him but *one*, he will ſoon make it *as valuable* as all the reſt; leave him, I ſay, but *one*, to *ſet his Foot upon*, and *like another* Archimedes, *he will ſhake the Chriſtian World.*

And thus we have ſeen a fair Account and true Hiſtory *of his Manuſcripts*; how from *twenty*, they dwindled *to eight*; from *eight* to *four*; from *four* to——And is not this *Father Amelote* all over? And muſt not Envy it ſelf confeſs, that *our Editor's Imagination* is full as lively; his *Rhetorick* as ſtrong, as that of his *Reverend Brother?*

But he thinks it, we find, wondrous hard, that *Dr.* Mill *ſhould ſo oft be caſt in his Teeth* [*], and that he ſhould be charged with reflecting upon a Perſon *whom he had not ſo much as named in his Propoſals:* What *juſt and critical* Reaſoning is this? He has not abuſed *Dr.* Mill *in his Propoſals*, nor Dr. *Colbatch*, I warrant ye, in *this his Defence* of them, becauſe he has not mentioned ſo much as the *Name of either*. But is not the *Doctor's Edition* included in the *general Cenſure*, he has paſſed *upon all*, without Exception or Reſerve? Nay, is it not particularly *levelled at and deſcribed*, *by that*; *which gives ſuch Offence to good* [†] *Perſons, that, whoſe Pages are crowded with*

[*] p. 34.

[†] p. 42.

[*] p. 41. 14.

[†] par. 3.

ſuch Numbers of various Readings? However, he is very confident, that there can be no *Compariſon* between the *Doctor's Work and his*, they being *different* toto genere *from each other* *, the Doctor's Ambition reached no higher than to give the *Text of Printer* Stephens; but he reſolves to preſent the World with *that of the famous Origen*; the Doctor's View was no more than to provide *a Promptuary for the Judicious*; but it is he who muſt apply this Promptuary to Uſe and Practice. Thus the *one* is but a *mere Collater*; *the other the Critic*; the *one* furniſhes *Tools*, but the *other* muſt find *the Uſe* of them. * p. 14.

But we need not wonder at his taking ſo much Liberty with *the Dead*, when 'tis common with him to make full *as free with the Living*; even Sir *Iſaac Newton* himſelf; whoſe great and admirable Diſcoveries in *Mathematicks* and *Natural Philoſophy* were, according to him, but *uſeleſs*, *empty* Speculations, of no Benefit or Service to Mankind, till he was pleaſed, as he has told us in Print [a] *to diſcover to the World the unknown Uſe of them*, and to apply them, as he deſigns to do with Dr. *Mill*'s Promptuary, to the ſilencing of *Atheiſts*.

We have brought him, however, to ſpeak, with ſomewhat *more Modeſty* than before, of his *intended Edition*; for he condeſcends † to own, that he will do Dr. *Mill* the Honour to make uſe of *his Collection*; and becauſe his main Objection to the *Doctor's Edition* ſeems now to be chiefly from the *Form* and *Manner* of it, from the *Management* and *Diſpoſition of the Materials*, I ſhall endeavour to ſet the Matter in ſuch a Light, as will make it eaſie for the Reader to determine the Controverſy; in order to which I ſhall deſire him to anſwer me two or three plain Queſtions. † p. 14.

Whether all the *various Readings* of the *New Teſtament* are not rather *curious* and *nice* Obſervations, than Diſcoveries of any *real Service to Chriſtianity*; and uſeful rather to the *Learned*, than the *Chriſtian* Reader? Whether all of them together

---

[a] *Vid.* Dr. *Bentley*'s Letter to the Biſhop of *Ely*.

affect or *alter* in any Manner any *Article of Faith*, or even *Moral Precept?* Whether in *Stephens*'s *Edition* we have not the *full* and *adequate* Senſe of the *ſacred Text* in all Points even of the *leaſt Importance?* Whether a correct and juſt Tranſlation of *that Edition* would not be ſufficient for the People to all *Intents* and *Purpoſes of Religion?*

If *theſe Queries* be anſwered in the *Affirmative*, as I am certain they muſt, and as *he himſelf has already done*; I ſhall take the Liberty to aſſert and maintain that Dr. *Mill*'s Edition (as it exhibits *Stephens*'s *Text*, with all the known *various Readings* under it) is for the very *Form* and *Manner* of it more *uſefully* and *judiciouſly* contrived for the Service of the *Learned* or even *Chriſtian* World, than any other which *our Editor* can pretend to give us.

Is it not the ſame thing to the Reader, conſidered as a *Scholar*, whether he finds the *true Readings* with *their Authorities* at the *Top* or *Bottom* of the Page? inſerted in the *Text*, or placed in the *Margin?* Cannot he aſſert and apply them with the ſame Force in all *Critical Controverſies?* Is not *the Text* made as *clear* and *certain* by them, in the one way as the other?

Dr. *Mill* believed, that [*a*] he had mended *Stephens*'s *Text* in *two thouſand* Places; he believed likewiſe, that he had *retrieved moſt of the true Readings of the Old Vulgate, with the very Greek from whence they were taken*; yet he never imagined, that his *Emendations* would loſe any of their *Force* or *Merit* by being placed with his Notes at the *Bottom of the Page:* He knew, that however *probable any Readings* might appear to him, they were not however *demonſtrable*, and what *one Man* might look upon to be *Genuine*, *another* would ſtill argue to be *Spurious*; and that the making ſo *many Alterations in the Text* would give *Offence* to many, do *Service* to none, any occaſion onely *perpetual Diſputes* about Trifles.

[*a*] *Vid.* Mill. Prolegom. it. vid. p. 41.

Thus for inſtance, if Dr. *Mill* had inſerted his two *thouſand Alterations* into *the Text*, we ſhall find preſently that *our Editor* was actually prepared and reſolved to have *fetch'd them down* * *again*, and reſtored them to *the Place* from whence * p. 33. they were taken; and what would have been the Conſequence? Why, *his own Emendations*, when advanced in their ſtead, would have found no better Fate; for as little as I pretend to *Criticiſm*, I would undertake to *throw out* a great Part of them my ſelf, as we ſhall ſee by and by, when we come to *his Specimen*; and thus after much Squabble and Wrangling, we ſhould find our ſelves at laſt juſt where we firſt ſet out, ſetling again perhaps in the old *Text of Stephens.*

But Dr. *Mill*, he tells us, † *follows this ſame Text of* † p. 14. Stephens *to a Letter, even where he decides againſt it*; what, *decide for* and *againſt it* at the ſame time? This, he thought, muſt needs make the Reader exclaim at the *Doctor's great Stupidity*; and yet the Caſe is no more than this: The *Doctor's Deſign* in his Edition was to exhibit *Stephens*'s *very Text* moſt punctually, without *any the leaſt* Variation from it; to this he ſubjoins all the *various Readings*, with ſome *Critical Notes* occaſionally giving us his Judgment upon the *ſaid Text*. In many Places, it ſeems, he *decides* againſt it; but how then does he *follow it at the ſame time?* Or how is it poſſible to do *both* in the ſame inſtance? So that this *Jumble of Words*, deſigned as a Reflection on the Doctor, proves to be a meer *Piece of Jargon*, and *Nonſenſe* of our *Editor*'s own.

I am far from believing Dr. *Mill* to have been infallible, or *his Edition* without *Faults*; being perſuaded, that no Man in the World ever yet executed a Deſign *ſo laborious and extenſive* without committing *many*; but as they bear no Proportion to the *juſt Merit* of his Performance, they may and ought to be forgiven. If the Doctor indeed, in his *large Prolegomena*, had given as many *ſolid Proofs of Ignorance*, as *our Editor* in the *Half-ſheet of his Propoſals*, or if, in any *whole Book of the New Teſtament*, he had made as *many Blunders*, and ſuffered as *much Incorrectneſs*, as *our Editor* has in the *ſingle Chapter of his Specimen*, I am ſatisfied, that Men of Letters would never have endured *his Edition*.

Since I have had Occaſion to ſay ſo much here of Dr. *Mill*, it may be proper to bring together, under *one View*, whatever relates to him in the preſent Controverſy; and to take notice once for all of the *ſcurrilous* and *inhuman* Treatment which *our Editor* has thought fit to ſhew to his *worthy deceaſed Friend*.

He had formerly much *courted* and *careſſed this Gentleman*, and for the *Credit of his Friendſhip* and his *Countenance*, had paid him *very extraordinary Complements in his Life-time:* In a printed Letter to him, he ſays, [*a*] *That he was the moſt experienc'd of all Men living in the Knowledge and Study of Manuſcripts*; *that in collecting Materials for his Edition, he had nicely and curiouſly examined all the Writings of the Fathers, all the ancient Verſions, and an infinite Number of Manuſcripts*; that *his Edition would be an Ornament to his Country, and a Safeguard to the Church*; and that *whoever purchaſed it might fancy himſelf in a manner turning over and reading the very Originals*; nay, ſince his Death, before he had any *particular Intereſt* in undervaluing him, he has done him the Juſtice to ſpeak of him in much the *ſame ſtrain*, and declared [*b*] that his *Friendſhip and Memory would ever be dear to him*.

Yet now there is hardly a Paragraph in this Book of his, without ſome *ſpiteful*, *ſevere Reflection* upon his *Merit* and *Character*; but in *his thirty-third Page* he labours more eſpecially to overthrow *all his Credit*, with *three* particular Inſtances of his *great Weakneſs* and *want of Judgment*.

[*a*] Tu vero, Milli doctiſſime, qui omnium mortalium maxime in eo ſtudio verſatus es.

Quippè etenim ad eam copiam comparandum omnia S. Patrum ſcripta, omnes antiquas verſiones, & infinitam vim Codd. MSS. curioſè excuſſiſti. Ea res Britanniæ noſtræ ſplendori erit & Eccleſiæ præſidio. Adeo ut qui tuam Editionem ſibi comparaverit, ipſa illa propemodum Archetypa verſare manibus, atque oculis uſurpare videatur. Vid. Jo. Malalæ Hiſt. per Jo. Millium, una cum Epiſt. Rich. Bentleii.

[*b*] Remarks on Freethink. part 1. p. 61.

The firſt is from *the Uſe he makes of ſcrub Manuſcripts and ſcoundril Copies*; for having *deſcribed a Manuſcript*, ſays he, *to be, not Vellum, but Paper, and of a recent Hand, yet this worthy one has eleven of his true Readings; and ſo he deals with the reſt.*

But let us here aſk *our Editor*, whether *all Criticks* are not agreed, that *recent Manuſcripts* are not to be neglected in a Work of this Nature, and that they may ſometimes afford *probable* or *genuine Readings* which have not been met with before, as well as give farther Light and Confirmation to thoſe that have. This he himſelf has declared to be true in Fact as *to the Manuſcripts of* Terence; *the oldeſt and beſt Copy of him*, ſays he, [*a*] *is now in the Vatican Library, which comes neareſt to the Poet's own Hand, but even that has hundreds of Errors, moſt of which may be mended out of other Exemplars, which are otherwiſe more recent, and of inferior Value.*

It is very poſſible, and certainly true in ſome Inſtances, that *Manuſcripts of Modern Date* may have been copied from others very *ancient and correct*, which have afterwards been loſt; the Doctor's Deſign led him to examine *all the Manuſcripts* he could come at, both *Old* and *New*, he gave their *due Weight* and *Preference* to the *older* and *better*, and has in Fact collected the *Readings* of all the moſt *ancient* and *valuable ones* then known in the World. How ſilly is then the Objection, that out of *two thouſand Readings*, which he preferred to the common ones, he has pick'd *eleven out of a recent Manuſcript?* It can deſerve onely to be laughed at, and diſcovers much more the *Malice of our Editor*, than any *Ignorance in the Doctor.*

The other *two* Inſtances of the *Doctor's want of Judgment* I ſhall give likewiſe *in his own Words: He has*, ſays he, * *two Characteriſtics to judge by (as any one that will peruſe his* Prolegomena *will ſee) Omiſſions and Soleciſms. If a Word or Words are omitted in any Copies, out they muſt go, as Interpolations;*

* p. 33, 34.

[*a*] Ibid. p. 64.

theſe make fifteen hundred at leaſt out of his two thouſand. And what is very extraordinary, the more Significancy, the more Importance the omitted Words have, the more confident he is, that they are ſpurious and interpolated; and for this ſpecious Reaſon, Quis ſanus tam inſigne verbum omiſerit, prӕterierit, expunxerit? *What Copyiſt in his Wits would leave out ſo conſiderable a Word, if he found it in the Exemplar that he tranſcribed? One may ſay,* Quis ſanus *could argue at this Rate? Is a Word ſo conducing to the Clearneſs, Grace, and Beauty of the Sentence (as the Doctor often allows) and confirm'd by the oldeſt Copies and Verſions to be caſt out of the Text, becauſe one drunken or drowzy Stationer's Boy happened to omit it? God forbid; and yet this is his perpetual Manner. The other is Solœciſm, which decides the Remainder of his Genuine Readings: If in a few, or in one Manuſcript, there's a Reading that makes an* ἀνακόλουθον, *an Abſurdity, a Barbariſm, he ſeldom fails to warrant it for true. In ſhort, in his Scheme, whatever appears bright and elegant, (if one Copy does but fail in it) is an Emendation of ſome Copyiſt: whatever appears impolite, idiotic, abſurd, (if the moſt ſcoundril Copy countenances it) is* manus Apoſtoli.

This is *the Charge* which he has brought againſt Dr. *Mill*; and if we allow for the *Extravagance*, the *Partiality* and the *falſe Colours* with which it is drawn, every Body will eaſily ſee, that the *Doctor is much in the right*, and that *his Notions*, tho' capable of being ſtrained and carried too far, are in general *juſt* and *true*; and *theſe very Rules*, tho' like all others, not *without Exception*, are certainly *good* and *proper* to be obſerved by *an Editor of the New Teſtament.*

Let us conſider then *the firſt of theſe Characteriſtics*; and ſince *our Editor* has not thought fit to try the Merit of it by any *particular* Inſtances or Examples of *falſe Readings*, which have been put upon us by it, we can onely conſider it *abſtractedly* and in *general*, without taking in the Circumſtances of *older* or *better Manuſcripts* on one ſide or the other. Suppoſe then that *ſome Copies* exhibit a Word of *great Significancy*, to clear and determine the Senſe of a Paſſage, otherwiſe *dark* and *obſcure*; and that *other Copies* are ſtill found to be without *this Word*; the Queſtion is, how we are to determine the *genuine Reading*; Dr. *Mill* ſays, that the *Word is ſpurious*, and does not belong *to the Text*; *our Editor* affirms the contrary, and reaſons thus; *Is a Word ſo conducing to the Clearneſs, Grace and Beauty of the Sentence (as the Doctor often allows) to be caſt out of the Text, becauſe a drunken, drowzy Stationer's Boy happen'd to omit it? God forbid.*

But will not this Reaſoning ſerve to defend almoſt *all Interpolations* whatſoever? And yet is it not allowed, that there are a great many of them in the Scriptures, and that they are much more numerous than the *Omiſſions?* Our Editor ſays, that in *the Chapter* of his *Specimen*, he has made *fifty-two Emendations*; that is, he has taken *fifty-two various Readings* from the Bottom of Dr. *Mill*'s *Page*, and removed them into *the Text*; yet of theſe *fifty-two Alterations*, a great Part are made according to *this very Rule of Omiſſions*, ſeveral of them ſupported by the Authority onely *of a ſingle Manuſcript*; for Example, Καθαρὸν ποταμὸν, *ver.* 1.] *omittunt* καθαρὸν, *Alex. Codd. Anglici duo Gallici tres*, &c. Ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ Αλφα, *ver.* 13.] *omittunt* εἰμὶ, *Alex. Athanaſius Codd. fere omnes*; *Andreas, Arethas. Sed Origines habet* εἰμὶ *bis.* Ἰησȣ̃ Χριςȣ̃. *ver.* 21.] *omittit Alex.* And again in the ſame Verſe, Μετὰ πάντων ἡμῶν Ἀμὴν] *omittit* ἡμῶν Ἀμὴν *Alex.* He has already, we know, determined *againſt the Genuineneſs of the famous paſſage of St.* John 1 Epiſt. v. 7. *a Reading*, by far the *moſt important of all the thirty thouſand*; ſupported by *good Authorities*, and conſonant and agreeable to the *Doctrine of the Apoſtle:* For what Reaſon then has he *condemned it as ſpurious?* Why becauſe *ſome Manuſcripts and ſome Fathers* have *omitted* it. And this ſure is carrying the *Rule of Omiſſions* much farther than Dr. *Mill himſelf*, tho' it was, he tells us, † *his peculiar Foible:* For *the Doctor* happens here to be *on the other ſide* of the Queſtion, and in *this Inſtance* has declared, even againſt *his favourite Rule*, for *the common Reading* of our printed Copies. † p. 42.

And now will not *his own Argument* turn *much more forcibly* againſt himſelf? *Are Words ſo ſignificant, ſo important, ſo conducing to the Clearneſs and Beauty of the Sentence to be caſt out of the Text, becauſe a drunken or drowzy Stationer's Boy happened to omit them? God forbid*; and *yet this is his perpetual Manner.*

But let us now hear a little on the other hand, what *the Doctor* has to alledge *in defence of his Rule.* Why he ſays, that it is more probable, that a *Tranſcriber* would chuſe rather to *clear* up an *obſcure Paſſage*, by the Inſertion of an *explanatory*, *ſignificant* Word, than to *darken* and *confound a clear one*, by *omitting* or *expunging ſuch a Word*; and he would defend himſelf by ſhewing, that it is in the *perplexed* and *dubious Paſſages of Scripture*, that *Interpolations* are generally found; that *moſt Interpolations of the Text* were derived originally from the *Margin*, where it was uſual to place *Words or Sentences of plain and obvious Senſe*, to explain ſuch as were *more difficult in the Text*; that theſe by degrees crept into *the Text itſelf*; the *Tranſcribers* thinking they did no harm, by making it more intelligible; and that this was the common Practice of the Copyers of St. *Jerom*'s *Days*, who ſays, [a] *that they were uſed to write, not what they found, but what they underſtood*; and that this is not *meer Conjecture* or *Speculation*, but what all, who are converſant *in Manuſcripts*, will find confirmed and demonſtrated by Fact and Experiment; and this I take to be a ſufficient Juſtification in general of Dr. *Mill's firſt Rule of Criticiſm*, viz. that *of Omiſſions.*

Let us now proceed to examine *the ſecond*; which *our Editor* calls *that of Solecism*; and here he thinks he has done the *Doctor's Buſineſs*; has painted him *to the Life*, and has ſaid enough to make him juſtly *odious* to all good *Chriſtians.* What is the *Style of Scripture ſo baſe, vulgar, idiotic*, ſo *full of Barbariſms*,

---

[a] Librariorumque incuriæ, qui ſcribunt non quod inveniunt, ſed quod intelligunt; & dum alienos errores emendare nituntur, oſtendunt ſuos, Hier. ad Lucin. Tom. 4. p. 578.

bariſms, *Soleciſms*, and *Abſurdities*, as Dr. *Mill* pretends? *God forbid.* Nothing ſure but what is *bright*, *elegant* and *polite*, *could come from the Hand of an Apoſtle.* Here we ſee *two contrary* Judgments paſſed upon the *Stile* and *Language* of *the ſacred Penmen*, *by Dr. Mill*, and *our Editor*; and the Reader by determining which of them is the *true one*, may in ſome Meaſure decide at the ſame time the *main Point* in Queſtion, about *our Editor's Talents* for the Work he has undertaken, and how far he is qualified to give us an *Edition of the New Teſtament*.

St. *Paul* tells us, *that he was ſent by Chriſt to preach the Goſpel*, [a] *not with Wiſdom of Words*; nor *with Excellency of Speech*; nor with *enticing Words of Man's Wiſdom:* And leſt *our Editor* ſhould ſay, that theſe diſabling Expreſſions are but *Strains of Humility*, uſual with and becoming *the Apoſtle*; his *Friend St. Jerom* has told us [b] quite the contrary; *that it was not any Humility in St.* Paul, *but a Conſcientiouſneſs of the Truth, which drew from him theſe Declarations*; and *he ſhews* [c] *it to have been with the Apoſtles, in this Caſe, juſt as with all other Men, and that they diſcover in their Writings the Idioms and Phraſes peculiar to their native Country and Language:* He warns us often, [d] *not to be offended at the Simplicity or Lowneſs of the Scripture-Stile*; for he tells us, [e] *that the want of Elegance in the Words of the ſacred Writers was ſufficiently made up by the forcible Eloquence of their Sanctity, and the Loftineſs of their Thoughts and Sentiments.*

The *Ancient Greek Fathers*, who are certainly the beſt Judges of the *Greek Stile* of the Scriptures, are intirely of the *ſame* Opinion. The *firſt Chriſtian Critick Origen* makes no

---

[a] 1 *Cor*. i. 17. ii. 1, 4.

[b] Nequaquam Paulum de humilitate, ſed de conſcientiæ veritate dixiſſe, etiam nunc approbamus. Hier. ad Algas.

[c] Multa ſunt verba, quibus juxta morem urbis & provinciæ ſuæ familiariùs Apoſtolus utitur—Nec hoc miremur in Apoſtolo, ſi utatur ejus linguæ conſuetudine, in qua natus eſt & nutritus. Ibid.

[d] Nolo offendaris in ſcripturis ſanctis ſimplicitate & quaſi vilitate verborum, *&c.* Hier. Epiſt. 2. ad Paulum.

[e] Loquendi ſimplicitatem excuſabat ſanctimoniæ magnitudo. Hier. ad Pamm. de opt.

Scruple to declare his Judgment on this Occaſion with as *much Freedom*, and in *much the ſame Terms* with Dr. *Mill himſelf*. The *Diſciples of Chriſt*, ſays he, [a] *renounced all artful Compoſition of Words*, and *what the Scripture calls the Wiſdom of Men: And Divine Providence accommodated* [b] *the Language of Scripture, not to the Learned among the* Greeks, *but to the Idiotiſm of the Multitude*. And again, [c] *the Apoſtles, being conſcious of their Imperfection this Way, called themſelves Idiots in Speech, but not in Knowledge.*

St. *Chryſoſtom* ſtill goes farther, and ſpeaks *more freely* upon this Subject; *When the* Greeks, ſays he, [d] *accuſe the Diſciples (as Idiots)* that is, *illiterate*, let *us join with them*, and *accuſe them on this account more freely even than they*; and *he laughs at the* [e] *Simplicity of a zealous Chriſtian, who, in a Diſpute with a* Greek, *laboured to prove St.* Paul *to be more eloquent than* Plato; and *leſt we ſhould make our ſelves ridiculous in ſuch Diſputes*, he bids us [f] *freely own the Apoſtles to be ignorant and unlearned, ſuch an Accuſation being not any Reflection upon them, but their Praiſe and Glory.*

After theſe Authorities, I need not trouble myſelf with producing any Opinions *of the Moderns*; but whenever *our Editor* thinks fit to diſpute this Point more fully or particularly, I will undertake to defend the Judgment of *theſe Fathers* and Dr. *Mill* by undeniable Inſtances, and ſhew the *Stile of Scripture* to be ſo little agreeable to the *Purity of the Greek Language*,

---

[a] Οἱ τοῦ Ιησοῦ μαθηταὶ οἱ μακρὰν χάιρειν εἰπόντες τῇ ποικίλῃ τῶν λέξεων συνθέσει καὶ τῇ ὡς ὠνόμασεν ἡ γραφὴ, σοφίᾳ ἀνθρώπων. Orig. contr. Celſ.

[b] Οὕτως ἡ προνοουμένη θεία φύσις οὐ τῶν πεπαιδεῦσθαι νομιζομένων μόνον τὰ Ἑλλήνων ἀλλὰ ϗ τῶν λοιπῶν Ἑλλήνων, συγκατέβη τῇ ἰδιωτείᾳ τοῦ πλήθους. Ibid.

[c] Ὀυκ ἀσυναίσθητοι οἱ ἀπόστολοι τυγχάνοντες τῶν ἐν οἷς προσκόπτουσι, φασὶν ἰδιῶται εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ ἀλλ᾽ οὐ τῇ γνώσει. Orig. Philoc. c. 4.

[d] Ὅταν οὖν Ἕλληνες κατηγορήσουσι τῶν μαθητῶν ὡς ἰδιωτῶν, πλέον ἡμεῖς ἐκείνων κατηγοροῦμεν αὐτῶν. Chryſ. Hom. 3. in 1 Cor. 1.

[e] περὶ Παύλου ϗ Πλάτονος ζητήσεως οὔσης, ὁ δὲ χριστιανὸς ὑπ᾽ ἀφελείας ἐσπούδαζε κατασκευάζειν ὅτι Πλάτονος λογιώτερος ἦν ὁ Παῦλος. Ibid.

[f] Ἵν᾽ οὖν μὴ καταγελώμεθα, κατηγορῶμεν ἀποστόλων ὡς ἀμαθῶν, ἡ γὰρ κατηγορία αὐτὴ ἐγκώμιον. Ibid.

guage, that whenever the *Doctor's Soleciſms*, *Hebraiſms*, or *Idiotic Phraſes* ſtand in Competition for a Place *in the Text*, with our *Editor's bright*, *elegant*, *polite Expreſſions*; every *judicious Reader* will think it wiſeſt and ſafeſt to *agree with the Doctor*, in giving a general Preference to *the former*.

After all this *Scurrility* and *Contempt* thrown out ſo plentifully upon *the Doctor*, he comes off very calmly and ſmoothly at laſt, by charging *me* with being the Occaſion of it; declaring, * that *I made it neceſſary for him*, *againſt his own Inclination*, *to deal ſo freely with the Doctor*, which is ſuch a *Reflection* upon me, as I cannot help clearing my ſelf of, before I diſmiſs this Subject. * p. 34.

I have always had a very great Honour and Reſpect for Dr. *Mill*'s *Memory*, and was ſo far from deſigning to force *our Editor* to uſe him ill, that I was taking all the Pains I could, to make it *neceſſary* for him to *commend him*. I put him in mind of the *old Friendſhip and Intimacy* that had been *between them*; and did not this make it *neceſſary* to *commend him* when *dead*, whom he had profeſſed *ſuch a Love and Value for* when *living?* I ſhewed how much he muſt needs be obliged to him *in the Work*, he had undertaken; and did not this make it *neceſſary* to own the Obligation, and *commend his Benefactor?* I ſhew'd *the Doctor* to be a moſt *induſtrious*, *learned and judicious Editor of the New Teſtament*; and did not this make it *neceſſary* for a *Scholar*, a *Chriſtian*, a *Clergyman to commend him?* How then could I make it *neceſſary* to treat him *ſcurrilouſly* in any other poſſible Senſe, than as it is *neceſſary* for an *envious Critick* to *rail* at all who are *commended*; for a *proud Man* to *inſult* thoſe whom he is *moſt obliged*-to; for a *Mercenary Writer* to *undervalue* every thing, that ſtands in the Way of his *Gain and his Intereſt?*

Paragraph the Second.

The Author, *revolving in his Mind ſome Paſſages of St.* Hierom; *where he declares*, *that (without making a New Verſion) he adjuſted and reform'd the whole* Latin Vulgate to the beſt

Greek Exemplars, *that is, to thoſe of the famous* Origen; *and another Paſſage, where he ſays, that a Verbal or Literal Interpretation out of* Greek *into* Latin *is not neceſſary,* Except in the Holy Scriptures, *Ubi ipſe verborum ordo myſterium eſt,* Where the very Order of the Words is a Myſtery; *took thence the Hint, that if the Oldeſt Copies of the Original* Greek *and* Hierom's Latin *were examin'd and compared together, perhaps they would be ſtill found to agree both in Words and Order of Words. And upon making the Eſſay; he has ſucceeded in his Conjecture, beyond his Expectation or even his Hopes.*

REMARKS.

In *my Remarks on this Paragraph,* I had obſerved, that of the *two Paſſages* produced here from St. *Jerom,* as the *Reaſon* and *Foundation* of this intended *Edition, the firſt* was not to be found in any Part of *that Father's Writings,* in *direct* and *expreſs* Terms, and that the *ſecond* had been *altered* and *miſrepreſented by our Editor,* to make it *more applicable and full* to his Purpoſe. In Anſwer to my *firſt Obſervation,* he has by a Number of *Citations,* and a *Diſſertation* upon the Word *Evangelia,* † (proving what every body knew before) ſhewn at laſt that he did not at all apprehend *the Queſtion* I propoſed to him. I ſaid that St. *Jerom* had not in any *one ſingle Paſſage,* as he would make us believe, aſſerted, that he reformed *the whole Latin Vulgate:* and now how does he ſhew the contrary? Why, by labouring to prove, *conſequentially* and by Inference from *ſcattered Paſſages,* what I denied onely to be found *directly in any ſingle one;* and yet all that he has collected amounts to no more than what I have already owned; that St. *Jerom reformed* * *the Latin Vulgate of the New Teſtament;* but there was likewiſe *a Vulgate Tranſlation of the Old Teſtament* as well as *the New,* and *the whole Latin Vulgate,* which he talks of, muſt needs be underſtood to comprehend *them both.* He might therefore full as well have been contented with *my having allowed* him, as he ſays, * all that he wanted or expected;

† p. 17.

* p. 16.

* p. 19.

ed; rather than to have uſher'd in the moſt *important* Argument of the Controverſy, with an Introduction ſo little to the purpoſe; but he will not, it ſeems, accept any Conceſſion from ſo *ſilly an Adverſary*; for when I thought to have pleas'd him, by owning, that St. *Jerom* had reformed the *Vulgate Latin* according to the *beſt Greek Copies* of his Time; he proves, that they were not the *beſt Copies of his Time*, † but † p. 17. *old ones, and conſequently before his Time*; as if *the beſt* at any time were not always the *oldeſt* then known; this, to uſe *a Phraſe of his own*, is ſuch *capital*, *tranſcendent* Reaſoning, as I muſt own my ſelf at a loſs how to anſwer.

But he will needs force me into a Conſpiracy with Dr. *Mill in order to abuſe* * *poor St.* Jerom, becauſe I have ſaid of him, * p. 18. that he made no *very great Alteration* in his *Reform of the Vulgate*; and yet I ſaid no more than what I proved from *his own Words*. But if this be a Reflection, what will he ſay to me, if I undertake to ſhew, that of *the Alterations*, which he actually made, *ſome* might much better have been ſpared; the *old Tranſlation* being *juſter* and *truer* in ſeveral Places than *his Corrections?*

But after all this Noiſe about the *old Vulgate*, or, as many have called it, *the Italic Verſion*; the World, it ſeems, is yet entirely in the dark about it; for when *our Maſter's Edition comes* out, it will ſhew that there *never was any ſuch Verſion in Being*, as the * *Learned*, and Dr. *Mill eſpecially*, have ſo * p. 18, 26. long been *blundering about*; and that the Notion was *falſly grounded* upon an † *abuſed* and *miſtaken Paſſage of St.* Auſtin; † p. 43. which our Editor will ſet in a *true* and *new Light:* But we muſt not expect ſo great a Diſcovery in haſte; for till he has made all the Uſe he can of St. *Jerom*'s *reforming the old Vulgate*, it will hardly be worth while to prove that there never was *any old Vulgate at all*; but for all the *new* and *true Light* he has got in this Matter, I will promiſe to ſhew whenever he calls upon me, that among thoſe *innumerable Verſions*, he ſpeaks of, which * appeared in *the Weſtern World*, *before* * p. 26.

St. Jerom's *Time*, there was however a *particular* and *principal one*, diſtinguiſhed from the reſt by *its Uſe* and *Credit in the Church*, under the Name of the *Old*, the *Common*, the *Vulgate*, or, as *he himſelf* [a] has called it, the *Italic*. He may now perhaps be out of humour *with ſome* one of theſe Names, and diſpute, if he pleaſes, *about Words*, but I defie him to prove, that there was not ſuch a *particular Verſion*, as I have here deſcribed.

We are now come once more to the Examination of his *ſecond Paſſage*, viz. *Ubi ipſe verborum ordo Myſterium eſt*, on which he ſays, I have *ſweated* and *laboured* † *ſo hard in my Remarks, for three whole Pages together*; but he gives me however the Pleaſure of finding, that it was not *Labour in vain*; ſince my *three Pages* have coſt him above *twice the Number* to *contrive an Anſwer* to them. My *firſt Remark* here was, that he had not *dealt fairly* either with *us or St. Jerom*, in his *Quotation* of this Sentence; which I found in the *Words of the Author* to be thus: *Ubi & verborum ordo & Myſterium eſt*. In a Paſſage of *ſuch Moment*, on which ſo much Streſs was laid, and ſo great a Deſign was built, the World had a Right to expect the *utmoſt Exactneſs of Citation*, and the *very Words of the Original*. There can be no other Reaſon for *miſquoting any Author*, but either *too much Art*, or *too much Negligence*; either of which will make but a wretched Apology for *an Editor of the New Teſtament*; where *Diligence* and *Fidelity* are Qualifications of ſuch abſolute Neceſſity. A Critick who can allow himſelf in *ſuch Emendations* as theſe may well deſpiſe an Adverſary who * never made one in his Life; for he is ſure enough to have an Advantage over him: But *as our Editor* has always been very notable at an Excuſe, from the great Uſe and Exerciſe of his Invention that Way; he is pleaſed here to give us *two Reaſons* for this Inaccuracy, *viz. great Haſte* and *Candle-light* †. *The Propoſals*, it ſeems, *were drawn up in ſuch a Hurry*, and the Publication of them required *ſuch Diſpatch*, that he had not ſo much Time as even to *conſult his*

† p. 18.

* p. 19.

† Ibid.

---

[a] Rem. of Freethink. p. 81.

Books, *or correct the Preſs*; but being forced *to truſt his Memory* for *the Citation*, chanced to make *the little ſlip* we complain of. But is it not ſtrange, that after having been *revolving* and *tumbling* about in his Mind *one poor Sentence* for above *four Years* together, *his Memory* ſhould happen to fail him juſt in *the nick*, when he came to the *very Uſe* and *Application* of what he had *ſo long* been thinking of? but is it not ſtill ſtranger, that after having been writing and talking *ſo long*, with ſuch *Calmneſs* and *Deliberation* on this Subject, he ſhould be on a ſudden in *ſuch a Hurry* about it, as if no Time, but *one criticial Moment*, could poſſibly ſerve for the *printing his Propoſals?* He, *good Man*, was all *on fire* and *impatient* to do this publick Service to his Country, and had made a *Vow* perhaps never *to cloſe his Eyes* till he had made ſome Progreſs in ſo *pious a Deſign*; but the World happens to know him too well, to be ſo eaſily impoſed upon; if *his Motives* had been really ſuch as he pretends, there could not have been any Occaſion for an Excuſe of this Kind: A *true Reverence for Chriſtianity*, *a Zeal for the Intereſts of Religion*, would neceſſarily have forbid *all haſte*; would not have ſuffered the *leaſt Hurry*; would have obliged him to the *utmoſt Caution*, in a Work ſo *ſerious* and *important*. He here plainly diſcovers what I hinted at in *my Remarks*, that *his Propoſals were haſtened out to ſerve quite different Ends*, than *thoſe of common Chriſtianity*. It was neceſſary for his Circumſtances, that *ſome Noiſe* ſhould be made in the World *in his Favour*; ſomething muſt needs be done to ſupport *a declining Character*; ſomething *great* and *popular* muſt, in Appearance at leaſt, be undertaken, to recover *Eſteem* and *Applauſe* to himſelf, and caſt an *Odium* and *Contempt* upon *his Proſecutors*; and withal perhaps to demoliſh me the more effectually for having *libelled a Perſon* ſo highly deſerving of the Publick; ſo greatly and uſefully employed in the *Service of Chriſtendom.*

As for *his Candle-light*; I am not ſubtle enough to find out what Uſe he can poſſibly make of it. Among *the Greeks* and *Romans*

Romans it was ſo far from being *an Excuſe* for *the Blunders,* or *Inaccuracy of a Compoſition,* that *to ſmell of the Lamp or Candle,* was their *common Phraſe,* to expreſs an *over-laboured, affected Correctneſs*; but *our Critick's Lucubrations* are *the Reverſe,* we ſee, to thoſe of all *other Authors*; and *his ill-fated Lamp,* like ſome *malignant Planet,* ſpreads *Drowzineſs, Oſcitancy,* and *Stupour around it.*

Pinguem nebulam vomuere lucernæ, Juv.

The beſt Anſwer I can give him, is to return upon him *his own Words,* * *That no Scribler even out of the dark ever committed ſuch Stuff to Paper.*

* p. 24.

But this, he will ſay perhaps, was propoſed chiefly as *an Excuſe* for the *falſe Pointing, Accenting,* and other ſmall Miſtakes of his *Specimen*; and ſhould we allow it, yet even this will not much mend the Matter; for *Blunders,* like *Sins,* are ſome of *Ignorance,* and ſome of *Omiſſion*; and tho' *Haſte* or *Candle-light* may in ſome Meaſure *excuſe the latter*; yet both together cannot in any Manner apologize for the *former*; it is not for *Points* and *Accents* left out, or *little Omiſſions in his Notes,* that we complain of *his Specimen*; but that all the *Rules of Accents* are directly *violated* by a *contrary Application* of them; and there are ſuch *Soleciſms* and *Barbariſms of Stile,* as are offenſive to every Reader; and theſe will appear juſt the ſame *what Light ſoever* we write or read them by; *Errors of Judgment* having no more Relation to *Candle-light,* than thoſe of the *Memory.*

But ſhould this ſerve even as an Excuſe for the *firſt Edition of his Propoſals,* yet how is it at all applicable *to his ſecond?* Was this likwiſe drawn up in *ſuch haſte,* and prepared by *Candle-light?* Yet it was in all Points juſt the *very ſame* with the other, except in the Change of one of his *Emendations,* by reſtoring [ἐϖ' ἀυτὸν] to the Text [*v.* 18.] which he had thrown out before, upon the Credit of a *ſingle Manuſcript.* In his *third Edition* indeed, upon the Notice I had taken of his *many Blunders,* he has thought fit to alter *his Stile,* and to change the *many Barbariſms of his Notes*, into a Language more regular and intelligible, *viz.* inſtead of his *deeſt* δὲ *Alex. cæteri ferè omnes :* [*v.* 15.] *deeſt Articulus* ὁ *Alex. alii multi :* [ibid.] *deeſt* ϗ̀ *Alex. Codd. ferè omnes : ordine ut Andreas :* [*v.* 13.] he has now put *omittunt Codices*, or *deeſt in Codicibus* ; and *ordine quo Andreas.*

But the Reader will think it high time for me to come to the *Point in Queſtion*, an Examination of this *Paſſage of St. Jerom.* As for *our Editor's Emendation of it*, * (which I'll aſſure him was not new to me) it has no manner of Influence in the Diſpute, ſince I allowed him, as he owns, even before I had ſeen it, all that he pretends to infer from it. The whole Sentence runs thus : *Sed libera voce profiteor, me in interpretatione Græcorum, (abſque ſcripturis ſanctis, Ubi & verborum ordo & Myſterium eſt) non verbum è verbo, ſed ſenſum exprimere de ſenſu. Our Editor* from this Paſſage maintains, that St. *Jerom, in reforming the Vulgate of the New Teſtament, confined himſelf ſtrictly and religiouſly to the Order of Words in the Greek, believing it to be myſterious.*

* p. 18.

In a *printed Letter* [a] of his, which I have before-mentioned, he gives us this Account ; *About a Year ago*, ſays he, *reflecting upon ſome Paſſages of St.* Jerom, *that he had adjuſted and faſtigated the then Latin Vulgate, to the beſt Greek Exemplars, and had kept the very Order of the Words of the Original ; I formed a Thought* a priori, *that if St.* Jerom's *true Latin Exemplar could be come at, it would be found to agree exactly with the Greek Text of the ſame Age ; and ſo the old Copies of each Language, if ſo agreeing, would give mutual Proof, and even Demonſtration to each other. In this ſecond Paragraph of his Propoſals*, he tells us much the ſame Story, that if the *Old Greek Copies and St.* Jerom's *Latin were compared*, they would *be found to agree, not onely in Words, but in Order of Words.* This again he now calls * *a new and a noble Thought*, which

* p. 20.

---

[a] Vid. Two Letters to Dr. *Bentley*, with the Doctor's Anſwer.

muſt of Neceſſity be true, becauſe St. *Jerom,* he ſays, *durſt not have uſed this Expreſſion, if he had not kept cloſe to the Order of Words in his own Edition of the Scriptures.* But when † Ibid. he came to *make his Eſſay,* † then it was, that he *reaped moſt glorious Fruits of his Sagacity, and his Labour*; *the Succeſs,* he tells us, *not onely exceeded his Expectation, but even his Hopes*; *nay, he was even amazed, ſurprized, and aſtoniſhed*; at what, do you think? why to find *that the Learned Father had ſpoke true.* But does not this ſhew what an Opinion he had of his *Thought a priori,* as well as of the *good Father,* when it was Matter of *ſuch Aſtoniſhment* to him to find *any truth in either* of them? and yet after all, whenever he can ſhew that St. *Jerom* has affirmed the *perpetual Order of Words in Scripture to be a Myſtery*; every Body elſe will ſee, that the *Learned Father did not ſpeak true.*

But how at laſt was the *great Experiment* made? and this Truth ſo clearly demonſtrated? Why, the *Matter of Fact,* he * p. 23. ſays, * *verifies it*; *for there are four or five very old Manuſcripts extant, with the Greek on one hand, and a Latin Verſion on the other*; *in all which, Line anſwers to Line, and Word to Word in Order.* Theſe are *Beza*'s *Manuſcripts at Cambridge,* containing the Goſpels and Acts; another in the *Royal Library at Paris,* which is reckoned generally *the ſecond Part* of it, containing *the Epiſtles of St. Paul*; a third of the *ſame Epiſtles,* with the *Benedictines of St. Germain*; a fourth of *the Acts* now at *Oxford.* Theſe with the *Alexandrine* are allowed by all to be the *moſt ancient Manuſcripts,* now known in the World; nay, *our Editor himſelf* has told us, in *his Letter* already mentioned *to Dr. Mill* [b], *that they vaſtly exceeded, both in Worth and Antiquity, all others whatſoever, in any Part of the World,* and *that there was nothing extant at this Day, either like or ſecond to them*; *yet every one of theſe* have *been uſed* and *collated* not onely by Dr. *Mill*, but by *other Editors* before him; tho' now it ſeems to ſerve a preſent Purpoſe; we are to be amuſed with *an idle Story of much older* and *better Manuſcripts to be come at than prior Editors were acquainted with*. It muſt however without doubt give him much Comfort and Satisfaction to find theſe *good old Copies tally ſo exactly* together, and confirm *his noble Thought* ſo effectually; but I have an *unlucky Secret* to let the Reader into, which will ſoon put an End to his Raptures: For the *Latin of theſe Manuſcripts* happens not to be *that of St. Jerom*, but that of the *old Vulgate*, as it ſtood *before his Reformation* of it, which continued ſtill in the Uſe of the Church for two Centuries after he had made *his Corrections*.

---

[b] Atque hæc quidem talia Exemplaria, cùm aliis omnibus ubivis gentium, quod ſciamus, longè longèque & dignitate & tempore antecedant, neque quidquam hodiè ſuperſit ſimile aut ſecundum. Vid. Rich. Bentleii Epiſt. ad Jo. Millium, ut ſupra.

And this is not onely the Opinion of Dr. *Mill* [*a*], which *our Editor* has in ſo much Contempt, but of *all the beſt Judges*, and particularly Monſieur *Simon*, who [*b*] has made it very clear and evident by undeniable Arguments.

Thus *our Editor*, we ſee, has been taking Pains to *aſtoniſh* himſelf to very little Purpoſe; for he might have proved his Point full as well from *the Coptic*, as *the Latin of theſe very Manuſcripts*. If St. *Jerom*'s *Latin*, ſays he, * *could be come at*, it would be found *to agree minutely* with *the Greek*; yet when he comes to the Proof, he makes the Experiment with *Latin which was not St. Jerom*'s, nor ever at all touched by him. * par. 2.

But again, what *Greek* is this, that *tallies* ſo exactly with *this old Latin of his?* Why no other neither than *that of theſe ſame Manuſcripts*; but the Learned likewiſe are agreed, that theſe were not taken from the *good old Copies*, by which St.

[*a*] Qualis incedebat ante Caſtigationem Hieronymi (nam & ex his extat hodiè unum & alterum in Galliis, penes Monachos Benedictinos; hujuſmodi eſt Bezæ Cantab. Claromont. & Actorum Apoſt. Bodl. ut alia mittam) &c. Vid. Mill. Prolegom. p. 41.

[*b*] Simon Hiſt. Critique de N. T. p, 358. v. 1.

Jerom reformed the Vulgate; but were *thoſe very corrupt ones*, which *the Father ſo much complains of*; and were tranſcribed originally by *ſome of the Latin Church*, who had but little Skill or Knowledge of the *Greek*.

Having thus ſhewn what little Reaſon he has to be proud of *the Succeſs* of his *Experiment*, I ſhall now proceed to enquire into *the Notion it ſelf*; and prove *his new and noble Thought a priori*, to be *abſurd*, *ill-grounded*, and not at all *adequate* or *uſeful* to the Deſign he has built upon it: In order to which I have already obſerved that it is directly *contrary* to the whole Reaſoning and Tenor of *the Epiſtle*, from whence it is taken; and that in all the other Places of St. *Jerom*'s *Writings*, wherever *this Epiſtle* is referred to, or wherever he treats of the *Manner of Tranſlating*; he ſhews his Opinion to be *quite oppoſite* to it, and that in his *Verſions of the Scripture*, he followed *the Senſe* with *no ſtrict Regard to the Words or Order of Words:* ſo that upon the whole, I find it neceſſary to underſtand and explain *the Paſſage in Diſpute*, in a *qualified* and *limited Senſe*; as ſignifying nothing more, than *that St.* Jerom *in tranſlating Scripture, did not altogether take ſo much Liberty in departing from the Words, as in his Tranſlations of other Greek Books, becauſe he believed, that in a few particular Places of the Old Teſtament the Order of Words might poſſibly be myſterious.*

This I will ſhew to be the *true Senſe and Meaning of St. Jerom*, by the onely proper Method of coming at *the Senſe* of any Paſſage, *viz. by a nice Examination of the Context*, as well as all the *other Parts of his Writings*, which touch upon the Subject. The Account I gave of this *in my Remarks* is as follows, *viz.* *The whole Subject of this Epiſtle to* Pammachius *is the Defence of a Tranſlation he had made (not verbally, but according to the Senſe) of a Greek Letter ſent from one Biſhop to another; where beſides alledging the Practice of profane Authors, he ſhews, that the beſt Interpreters, even of Scripture, had no Regard in their Tranſlations, to the Words, or Order of Words,* *but to the Senſe onely; which he proves by ſeveral Inſtances from the Septuagint, the Evangeliſts, the Apoſtles, the Vulgate Edition it ſelf, and the Fathers.*

But here *our Editor* ſtops me ſhort, and tells me flatly, that *I lie moſt impudently*; † *for having read,* ſays he, *that ſhort Tract over on purpoſe, I aſſure you there is not one Word in it of beſt Interpreters, or Latin Vulgate, or Fathers.* † p. 21

Quid ais, O Columen Literarum, & noſtrorum temporum Ariſtarche? Hier.

Not *one Word* in it, ſay you, of *beſt Interpreters, or Latin Vulgate, or Fathers?* But if there be not the *very Word*, you will allow me, I hope, that there is *the very thing*; which is much more to my Purpoſe; and I ſhall not wonder at your catching ſo much *at Words,* where there is nothing elſe to lay hold of. As for the *Vulgate Verſion* [*a*], we find it twice ſaid in expreſs Terms, *the Vulgate Edition has it ſo and ſo.* This *our Editor* will ſay, is meant onely of *the Septuagint*, which St. *Jerom* calls here by that Name; tho' others will tell him that it is applicable, not to *the Original*, but to the *common Latin Tranſlation of it*. But be this as it will; he makes mention likewiſe of the *Latin Tranſlators* and *our Tranſlation*, which certainly comes up to *the thing*.

And as for *Fathers*; after he has alledged the Practice of *profane Authors* in Defence of his Way of tranſlating; when he comes to take notice of *Eccleſiaſtical Writers* or *Fathers*, he ſays thus [*b*]: *The time would fail me if I ſhould reckon up all*

[*a*] Vulgata quippè Editio ita ſe habet; hoc exemplum in vulgatâ Editione ſic fertur.

[*b*] Dies me deficiet, ſi omnium, qui ad ſenſum interpretati ſunt, teſtimonia replicavero; ſufficit in præſenti nominâſſe Hilarium confeſſorem, qui Homilias in Job, & in Pſalmos, tractatus plurimos in Latinum vertit è Græco, nec aſſedit literæ dormitanti; & putidâ ruſticorum interpretatione ſe torſit; ſed quaſi captivos ſenſus in ſuam linguam victoris jure tranſpoſuit. Nec hoc mirum in cæteris ſæculi videlicet aut Eccleſiæ viris, quum ſeptuaginta Interpretes, & Evangeliſtæ atque Apoſtoli idem in ſacris voluminibus fecerint.

all who have interpreted according to the Senſe; it is enough, for the preſent, to Name Hilary *the Confeſſor, who, in the Homilies on* Job, *and the Treatiſes upon the* Pſalms, *which he tranſlated into Latin, did not ſit nodding over the Letter, nor tormented himſelf with the nauſeous Interpretation of the Ruſtic; but by the Right as it were of a Conqueror, carried the Senſe away captive into his own Language; nor is this ſtrange,* continues he, *in profane or eccleſiaſtical Writers, when the ſeventy Interpreters, the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles do the very ſame alſo in the Holy Scriptures.* Here we ſee, that tho' the very Term, *beſt Interpreters*, be not mentioned, yet *the Epiſtle* is full of little elſe but Citations from ſuch as *all the Chriſtian World* muſt allow to be the *beſt Interpreters* that ever were; of which I ſhall now give a few, out of the many Inſtances here produced.

One of the firſt which St. *Jerom* takes notice of is from *Matt.* xxix. 9. where *the Evangeliſt* gives us the Citation of a *dark Prophecy*, fulfilled in *our Saviour*; and if the *Order of Words were a Myſtery*, we might ſurely expect to find it obſerved here, in a Paſſage *ſo myſtical* relating to the *Sufferings of the Meſſiah*; but inſtead of this, when St. *Jerom* has produced the Words of St. *Matthew*; *this Paſſage*, ſays he [a], *is taken from* Zachariah [xi. 12, 13.] *But it is found there in Words and Order of Words intirely different:* And after having produced the Words of the *Septuagint*, he ſays [b], *It is very clear what a Difference there is between the Evangeliſt and the Septuagint; but if we go ſtill to the Hebrew, though the Senſe be the ſame, the Words are different, as well as the Order of them.* And after having given his Tranſlation likewiſe of the *Hebrew*, he concludes [c], *Let them accuſe the Apoſtle of Falſhood, be-*

---

[a] Hoc invenitur in Zachariah, ſed aliis multo verbis, ac toto ordine diſcrepante.

[b] Quantum diſtet ab Evangeliſtæ teſtimonio Septuaginta Tranſlatio, perſpicuum eſt; ſed & in Hebræo quum ſenſus idem ſit, verba præpoſtera ſunt & pæne diverſa.

[c] Accuſent Apoſtolum falſitatis, quod nec cum Hebraico, nec cum Septuaginta congruat Tranſlatoribus; ſed abſit hoc de Pediſſequo Chriſti dicere, cui curæ fuit non verba & ſyllabas aucupari, ſed ſententias dogmatum ponere.

cauſe he agrees neither to the Hebrew, nor the Seventy; but far be it from us to ſay this of a Follower of Chriſt, whoſe Care it was, not to lie upon the Catch for Words and Syllables, but to give the true Senſe and Meaning of Doctrines.

Another Inſtance is from St. *John*'s *Goſpel* [xix. 37.] of a Citation likewiſe of a *Prophecy* of *our Saviour's ſuffering from* Zachariah [xii. 10.] and after having produced the Words of St. *John*, *the Septuagint*, and *Latin Tranſlation*, St. *Jerom* [*a*] ſays, *You ſee the Difference between the Tranſlation of the Evangeliſt, the Septuagint, and our own; and yet for all this Diſagreement in Words, they agree in Unity of Senſe.*

Upon another Inſtance of the ſame Kind, of a *Citation in Matthew* [i. 22, 23.] taken from *Iſaiah* [vii. 14.] *You ſee,* ſays he [*b*], *what a great Diſcord there is in Words and Order of Words between St.* Matthew *and the Septuagint; but you will have Occaſion to wonder ſtill more, if you conſult the Hebrew.*

It would be too tedious to produce *all the Inſtances* he has brought from St. *Mark*, St. *Luke*, and St. *Paul* to the ſame Purpoſe as theſe already taken notice of; and yet in *ſuch Paſſages* as theſe, which are of the *greateſt Importance*, and contain a *myſtical Senſe and Application to the Meſſiah*, we muſt needs have found, I ſay, if any where, the *Truth* and *Certainty of our Editor's Notion.*

St. *Jerom* concludes his Reaſoning here by ſaying [*c*], that *it is evident by all the Inſtances above-cited, that the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles, in their Interpretation of the old Scriptures, regarded the Senſe onely, and not the Words, and were not ſolicitous about the Words or Order of Words, if they could but make the Senſe intelligible.*

[*a*] Diſcrepat Evangeliſtæ, Septuaginta Interpretum, noſtraque Tranſlatio & tamen Sermonum varietas ſpiritûs Unitate concordat.

[*b*] Quanta ſit inter Mattheum & Septuaginta verborum, ordiniſque diſcordia, ſic magis admiraberis, ſi Hebraicum videas.

[*c*] Ex quibus univerſis perſpicuum eſt, Apoſtolos & Evangeliſtas in interpretatione veterum ſcripturarum, ſenſum quæſiſſe non verba; nec magnopere de ordine ſermonibuſque curâſſe, dum intellectui res pateret.

4 And

And now I would aſk any Man of common Underſtanding, whether it is *conceivable* or *poſſible*, that St. *Jerom* could believe the *general Order of Words to be myſterious*, when he is labouring with ſo much Pains to ſhew, that the *Septuagint*, *the Evangeliſts*, and the *Apoſtles*, did not at all regard it; when he is writing an Apology for *them* and *himſelf*, for the *Neglect of it*; when he is *expoſing his Adverſaries for not allowing him to do in a private Epiſtle, what they muſt*, he ſays [*a*], *whether they will or no, allow the others to have done in the Holy Scriptures.* I may defie any Man alive to believe ſuch an Abſurdity, except our *Editor* and *ſuch Creatures of his*, who can believe *any thing but their Maſter's Fallibility.*

This is an *exact* and *faithful* Account of *the Epiſtle to Pammachius*; which I have been the more particular in, to ſhew the Truth of the *ſhort Abſtract* I had given of it in *my Remarks*; which *our Editor here calls dull and falſe*, and for that Reaſon undertakes to give a *more clear and honeſt one*; which he begins thus; * *St.* Jerom *had tranſlated into Latin a complaining Letter of* Epiphanius *to* Chryſoſtom, *both his own Contemporaries, and was charged by ſome Friends to the latter, that he had not done Juſtice in his Verſion, nor tranſlated the Words exactly, but warped them, as they thought, to* Chryſoſtom's *Prejudice.*

* p. 20.

Could any Man who pretends to give a *true* and *exact* Relation of Fact, ever have ſet out ſo unhappily? For this *Letter of Epiphanius*'s was not written to *Chryſoſtom*, as he tells us, ſo *formally* and *circumſtantially*, but to *John Biſhop of Jeruſalem*; and the Blunder is the *more unlucky* for him, as it demonſtrably diſcovers a very great Ignorance *of St. Jerom*'s *Writings*; where the Controverſy between *Epiphanius* and *Biſhop John*, and the Part *this Father* acted in it, are ſo largely and frequently inſiſted on. There is among St. *Jerom*'s *Epi-*

[*a*] Ut reprehenſores meos arguam imperitiæ, & impetrem ab iis veniam, ut concedant mihi in ſimplici epiſtola, quod in ſcripturis ſanctis, velint nolint, Apoſtolis conceſſuri ſunt. Epiſt. ad Pamm.

ſiles this very *Tranſlation of* Epiphanius's *Letter*. *Jerom* ſided with *Epiphanius*, and was *excommunicated by John*; and beſides a frequent mention of the Caſe in *many of his Epiſtles*, he has left a very *long Treatiſe* in his Works, in which all the Errors *of this Biſhop* are collected and expoſed: yet *this is the Man* who pretends to *ſuch Familiarity with St. Jerom*; who inſults ſo often *my Ignorance* and *little Acquaintance* with him; yet I can tell him, with a great deal of Truth, that he has not produced *one ſingle Paſſage* from him, which I had not ſeen and conſidered, and knew to be nothing to his Purpoſe, long before he had taken ſuch Pains to convince us of it.

But I know what *our Critick* will have to ſay to all this, in his *next Anſwer*; he will tell us, that we may read *what Stuff* we pleaſe in our *vulgar interpolated Editions*, but that his *ancient Manuſcripts* tell him quite another Story; and *Johannes Hieroſolymitanus* was put corruptly by ſome *drunken*, *drowzy Stationer's Boy* for *Johannes Conſtantinopolitanus*. This is the Advantage which *Great Criticks* have over ſuch *poor Mortals* as never *made an Emendation*, of which we ſhall have more Occaſion to take Notice by and by.

In the reſt of *our Editor's* Account of *this Epiſtle*, there is no great Difference between us, except in *the Lie* he gives me about the *beſt Interpreters*, the *Vulgate Edition*, and *Fathers*. What Reaſon or Pretence he had for it, I muſt leave to the Reader, who will, I dare ſay, give me the *onely Satisfaction* I deſire, by ſhewing a *juſt Contempt* and *Deteſtation* of ſuch *brutiſh* and *infamous Scurrility*.

As for *the other Paſſages of St. Jerom*, I had ſaid in *my Remarks*, that I could produce *twenty*, to confirm the Truth of what I have advanced on this Subject. Here *our Editor* once more gives *me the Lie* †; but if it were not too impertinent and tedious to the Reader, I would undertake to ſhew him *twice the Number*; of which I ſhall give onely *ſuch a Specimen* at preſent, as will be ſufficient for my Purpoſe. † p. 21.

In his *Commentaries on Iſaiah*, he tells us [a], *that it is to be attended to very nicely, that in the many Citations which the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles brought from the old Scriptures, they did not follow the Order of Words, but the Senſe onely.*

In the *ſame Book*, he ſays [b], *that St.* Paul *in his Epiſtle to the* Corinthians *fetch'd Authorities from the Original Scriptures, not tranſlating Word for Word (which kind of Interpretation he perfectly deſpiſed) but expreſſing the Truth of the Senſe to confirm what he was proving.*

In his *Commentaries on Amos* he goes a ſtep farther, and tells us [c], *that not onely the Apoſtles, but the Apoſtolical Writers, in citing and tranſlating Texts of the old Scriptures, never regarded the Words but the Senſe onely.* There are, I believe, near *twenty Places in St.* Jerom, where this very *Obſervation* is repeated; and it is generally introduced with ſome particular Hint or Monition [d]; that it is to *be obſerved nicely, attended to diligently, and not onely in the Caſe mentioned, but every where. In his Commentaries on Galatians*, he ſays [e], *we are not to imagine that the Goſpel conſiſts in the Words of Scripture,* but *in the Senſe.* In *his Comment on the Epiſtle to Titus*, he ſays [f], *I follow rather the Senſe than the Words of Scripture.* In *his Preface to* Job; *this Tranſlation of mine*, ſays he [g], *will ſometimes follow the Words, ſometimes onely the Senſe,* and *ſometimes*

---

[a] In multis teſtimoniis quæ Evangeliſtæ vel Apoſtoli de libris veteribus aſſumſerunt, curioſiùs attendendum eſt, non eos verborum ordinem ſequutos eſſe ſed ſenſum. Comm. in Iſa. c. 5.

[b] Aſſumit Apoſtolus Paulus de authenticis libris, in Epiſtolâ quam ſcribit ad Corinthios: non verbum ex verbo reddens (quod facere omninò contemnit) ſed ſenſuum exprimens veritatem, quibus utitur, &c. cap. 64.

[c] Apoſtolos & Apoſtolicos viros, in ponendis teſtimoniis de veteri Teſtamento, non verba conſiderare ſed ſenſum. cap. 5.

[d] Curioſiùs attendendum; diligentiùs obſervandum; non ſolùm in præſenti loco, ſed ubicunque. Ep. ad Alg.

[e] Nec putemus in verbis ſcripturarum eſſe Evangelium, ſed in ſenſu. c. 1.

[f] Magis ſcripturarum ſenſum quam verba ſectamur.

[g] Hæc autem Tranſlatio nunc verba, nunc ſenſus, nunc ſimul utrumque reſonabit.

both. In his *Letter to* Sunnia *and* Fretela [*a*] *this Rule of tranſlating is to be followed, which I have often laid down, that where there is no Hurt to the Senſe, we ſhould obſerve the Propriety of the Language into which we tranſlate.*

In the *ſame Epiſtle,* he ſays [*b*], *if we ſhould tranſlate Word for Word, we fall into a falſe and erroneous Affectation, and our Tranſlation becomes abſurd.* And again [*c*], *while we follow this falſe and erroneous Affectation of interpreting, we loſe all the Beauty of the Tranſlation.*

In a *Letter to St. Auſtin,* he ſays [*d*], *this is my Rule, that where there is no Change in the Senſe, I may preſerve in my Tranſlation the Purity and Elegance of the Latin Tongue.* And he tells us expreſly, in his *Letter to Pammachius,* that this cannot be done *by tranſlating according to the Words or Order of Words:* For *how many things,* ſays he [*e*], *are elegant in* Greek, *which, if rendred Word for Word, are flat in* Latin? And, *on the contrary, what pleaſes us in* Latin, *if tranſlated according to the Order of Words, would be offenſive to them in the* Greek.

In Anſwer to all this *our Editor* ſhews, * from a Paſſage of * p. 22.
St. *Hilary,* that the *Latin Tranſlators of the Old Teſtament were nice and curious in obſerving the Words and Order of Words;* yet he ſhould have taken notice withal, that *Hilary is condemning* them for it at the ſame time. But we may obſerve here again, by the way, an Inſtance of his *ſingular Modeſty.* 'Tis *affirmed,* he ſays,
† *by the Fathers,* that the *old Latin Verſions ſtuck cloſe to the Order of Words,* † Ibid.
and produces for it this Paſſage of *Hilary;* yet

[*a*] Eadem igitur interpretandi ſequenda eſt regula, quam ſæpè diximus; ut ubi non ſit damnum in ſenſu, linguæ in quam transferimus, proprietas conſervetur.

[*b*] Quòd ſi transferre voluerimus ad verbum in κακοζηλίαν interpretationis incurrimus, & fit abſurda Tranſlatio.

[*c*] Et dum interpretationis κακοζηλίαν ſequimur, omnem decorem tranſlationis amittimus.

[*d*] Et nos hoc ſequimur, ut ubi nulla eſt de ſenſu mutatio, Latini ſermonis elegantiam conſervemus.

[*e*] Cujus rei exemplum ex noſtro ſermone capere poſſumus. Quanta enim apud Græcos bene dicuntur, quæ, ſi ad verbum transferamus, in Latino non reſonant; & è regione, quæ apud nos placent, ſi vertantur juxta ordinem apud illos diſplicebunt.

when I ſaid a little before, that *Jerom* had given Inſtances from the Fathers for his Way of tranſlating, which I grounded upon † p. 21. a Citation likewiſe from this ſame *Hilary*; he tells me, † *I lie*, and that there is *not one Word of the Fathers* in all that Epiſtle. However, what *Hilary* ſays here may eaſily be allowed him, and yet is nothing at all to his Purpoſe; for it is *theſe very Tranſlators*, that St. *Jerom* is ſo ſevere upon in every Part of his Writings: 'Tis this very Manner of tranſlating which he calls over and over again κακοζηλία, a falſe and *abſurd Affectation*, and *putrida interpretatio*; a *nauſeous Tranſlation.* He ſays frequently [*a*], that *Aquila was a Tranſlator of this kind, rendering Word for Word*; and tho' *for this* he was much admired by the *Jews*, yet he tells us [*b*], that for *the very ſame Reaſon, he was juſtly ſlighted and thrown aſide by Chriſtians*; *and calls him a troubleſome, contentious Tranſlator, for ſticking ſo cloſely to Words, Syllables and Letters.*

And now from theſe Authorities, together with what I have collected *in my Remarks*, we have a full and clear View of the Controverſy between *our Editor* and *my ſelf*; about our *different Expoſitions of this Paſſage of St. Jerom.* The Reader, I am ſatisfied, cannot help obſerving, that *my Explication* of it makes the *Learned Father* ſpeak *rationally*, *intelligibly*, and *conſiſtently with himſelf*; while *our Editor's Notion* charges *Nonſenſe*, *Abſurdity*, and *endleſs Contradictions upon him.*

But I am ſtill to give an Account why I confine *this Notion of St.* Jerom'*s to the Old Teſtament* onely. This I take to be intimated *in one Expreſſion* of this very Paſſage, *viz. Me in interpretatione Græcorum abſque Scripturis ſanctis*, &c. *In my tranſlating the Greek of the Scriptures*, ſays *St. Jerom*, *I did ſo and ſo.* Now it is allowed that he made *no Tranſlation at all*

[*a*] De Aquila autem non miror, quod eruditiſſimus linguæ Hebraicæ & verbum de verbo exprimens, &c. Comm. in Iſai.

[*b*] Aquila autem contentioſus interpres, qui non ſolùm verba, ſed etymologias quoque verborum transferre conatus eſt, jure projicitur a nobis—ille κακοζήλως & ſyllabas interpretatur & literas. Ep. ad Pamm.

of the Greek of the New Teſtament, but *in the Old tranſlated the Greek of the Septuagint,* as he tells us himſelf in ſeveral Places, particularly, *in a Letter to St. Auſtin,* ſpeaking of the *Old Teſtament,* he has the very Expreſſion, *ibi Græca tranſtulimus*; *there I tranſlated the Greek*; whereas in *the New,* he onely made ſome Corrections in *the common Latin Verſion* of his Time. The Words [*Scripturis ſanctis*] are applied by him likewiſe in *this Epiſtle* to the *Old Teſtament* onely, as in a Paſſage already cited, *Quod in Scripturis ſanctis velint, nolint Apoſtolis conceſſuri ſunt.* But his own Reaſoning is ſufficient to prove that this Notion muſt be reſtrained to the old Scriptures: For in the *Old Teſtament,* ſays he, * *that all* Origen'*s Allegories referred to the New*; *but in the* * p. 30. *New he could refer to nothing, but either commom Notions, or viſionary Schemes of his own.* This was ſtill confirmed to me by what I have obſerved, that the *Jewiſh Writers,* and ſuch as are infected with their Notions, are full of idle Whims about Myſteries in the Order of Words of the Old Teſtament. And St. *Jerom* himſelf, after he had learnt *Hebrew,* might probably be a little touch'd with *theſe kind of Fancies*; but *no one Writer,* that I know of, has affirmed, that *the Order of Words in the New Teſtament is myſterious.*

But here *our Editor* takes me ſeverely to taſk; and will ſhew me, † *that there is more in the Fathers,* than I muſt pretend to † p. 21. be acquainted with; and to expoſe my Ignorance the more, nothing will ſerve him, but a *Paſſage from St.* Jerom *himſelf,* whom I have been turning over with ſo much Care; who tells us [*a*] in *his Commentaries on the* Epheſians, *that in the Greek of the Scriptures, the Words, Syllables, Tittles, and Points are full of Senſes.* The Reader, I dare ſay, muſt at firſt be a good deal ſurprized to find *our Editor* proving the *Order of Words* to be a *Myſtery,* by ſuch a Paſſage as this, where there is not ſo much as a *Word, Syllable, Tittle* or *Point* that relates at all either to *Order of Words,*

[*a*] Sed quia ita habetur in Græco, & in divinis ſcripturis plena ſunt ſenſibus, ſinguli ſermones, ſyllabæ, apices, puncta, c. 3.

or Myſtery. But let us have a little Patience, and he will ſoon make it out to a Miracle; for he has got an *Argument* called *Parity of Reaſon,* which will prove to a Demonſtration, that *Syllables, Tittles, Points, muſt ſignifie Order of Words*; and *full of Senſes,* imply *Myſtery.* And now being ſure of Victory, he begins already to inſult, with *what ſays our Cenſor now? Are not Syllables, Tittles, Points, as ſmall things as the Order of Words? And muſt not, full of Senſes, mean deep, latent, recondite Senſes?* And *is not this as ſtrong an Expreſſion as Myſtery?* Many of his Creatures, I know, would bleſs themſelves here with Aſtoniſhment at *their Maſter's great Sagacity.* What *ingenious, what critical, what profound Reaſoning is this? How clear is it now our Maſter has found it out*; and *yet no Man could have found it out but himſelf?* But it happens a little unluckily, that St. *Jerom* ſeems to have diſclaimed all this Nonſenſe, which *our Editor* would faſten upon him: For in *an Epiſtle to Algaſia,* he ſays [a], *It is not in the Power of Language to expreſs deep, latent, recondite Senſes*; much leſs *can Tittles* and *Points do it.* But in order to ſet this Matter in a clear Light, let us take a Review of the whole Paſſage: St. *Jerom in his Commentaries on* Epheſians iii. 6. tranſlates *συγκληρονόμα, σύσσωμα, συμμέτοχα,* by *cohæredes, concorporales, & comparticipes,* and ſays, *that he knows theſe Words make but an aukward Figure in Latin*; *but becauſe it is ſo in the Greek,* and *that in the Holy Scriptures Syllables* (or the Appoſition of ſuch Conjunctions) *as well as the Points and Tittles have their Significations*; *magis volumus in compoſitione ſtructurâque verborum quàm intelligentiâ periclitari*; which *our Critic* tranſlates thus, *viz. We chuſe rather to forego* (that is, to let alone or not meddle with) *the Compoſition and Structure of the Words, than to weaken the Meaning*; whereas the Senſe is juſt *contrary,* viz. we *chuſe to venture upon coining and compounding Words, which are not ſtrictly Latin, rather than to run any Hazard in the Senſe.*

And now what is there in all this, which has *the leaſt View* or *Tendency* to *our Author's* Argument? What is there here ſaid of the *New Teſtament*, which may not be applied alſo in ſome Meaſure to *every other Greek Book?* And who beſides himſelf would ſay, that *the Compounding of Words by Prepoſitions*, and *the Points and Tittles in Greek are as inſignificant as the Order of Words?* A thing, in it ſelf *indifferent*, which may be varied and tranſpoſed without the leaſt Variation of the Senſe. Sure never any Authority was produced ſo *impertinently* as this; and I defie him to ſhew, that even *his own Freethinkers* ever interpreted any Citation *more blunderingly* or applied it more *aukwardly*. But if he could after all have made out of this Paſſage ſome *little Matter* to his Purpoſe, yet St. *Jerom* would tell him in his [a] Preface to this Book, that he ought not much to inſiſt upon it, becauſe he owns this Piece to be a *haſty*, *incorrect Performance*, and *not well digeſted* or *much thought of by him.*

---

[a] Profundos enim & reconditos ſenſus lingua non explicat.

We are now got through the Examination of *our Editor's new and noble Thought a priori*; how *noble* an one it is, the Reader is by this time ſufficiently convinced; but as to *the Newneſs* of it, it had been much more to his Purpoſe, I can tell him, if he could have proved it to be *an old one*; but ſince he values himſelf ſo much upon *its Novelty*; we muſt be ſo candid, as to allow him the *ſole and intire Credit* of it, and muſt own, that *no Man alive* ever dreamt of it before, or was *capable of forming it* but *himſelf.* But if, after all, it ſhould at laſt be found without a *juſt Foundation*; or ſhould fail him in any Part of what he has promiſed himſelf and the World from it; then this *whole Scheme* muſt appear to be wholly *uſeleſs* and *impertinent*; for *bating this Whim* about St. *Jerom*'s *Order of Words*, he cannot do any thing more with *his old Verſion* than what has effectually been done before him, by *much better and abler Hands*; excepting, I ſay, this *ſilly Notion*, all that can be done towards *ſettling the Genuine Text* from the *mutual Conſent and Agreement*

---

[a] Ut ſciatis me non cogitatum diu limatumque proferre Sermonem. Com. ad Epheſ.

in Words and the Order of them, has already been executed, as I have ſufficiently ſhewn in *my Remarks,* by *the Complutenſes, Eraſmus, Stephens,* Mr. *Toinard,* and Dr. *Mill.* Every one of theſe knew perfectly well how far the *old Greek* and *Latin Copies anſwered and tallied with each other*; not *one of them* but had made the Experiment in *many more Manuſcripts* [a], and *as old ones as he himſelf.* And not onely Dr. *Mill,* but *other Critics* have given us exactly the ſame Account he does of *thoſe very*
* p. 23. *old Manuſcripts* he ſpeaks of *, *how Line anſwers to Line, and Word to Word in Order* [b], *in the Greek and Latin.* This I deſire to be particularly obſerved by the Reader, becauſe *our Editor has the Face* to affirm, that not *one Editor* of them all, not Dr. *Mill by Name, had ever taken any Notice in their Collation of Manuſcripts of the Order of Words.*

It was no Secret, I ſay, *to prior Editors,* that the *old Verſion* was upon the Matter a *verbal Tranſlation*; not onely adhering pretty cloſely *to the Words,* but very much *to the Order of them too.*

Dr. *Mill* has ſhewn this to be *the Genius of the old Vulgate thro' every Book of the New Teſtament,* and has produced likewiſe *every Alteration,* now to be found, which St. *Jerom* made in it; and all this, with no other *View* or *Purpoſe,* than to prove and clear up *the Original Text*; and yet *our Editor* has the Aſſu-
* p. 14. rance likewiſe to affirm *, *that the Doctor never meddled at all with the Latin Vulgate, nor ever once dreamt of the excellent Uſe*

---

[a] Eraſmus inſtitutâ ſemel atque iterum Græcorum Exemplarium inter ſe & cum MSS. codicibus verſionis vulgatæ collatione ad Editionem, &c. Mill. Prolegom.

Adhibitis in conſilium utriuſque linguæ codicibus, vetuſtiſſimis ſimul & emendatiſſimis. Eraſm. ad Leon. x.

Porrò veterem verſionem negligendam non exiſtimavi, &c. Steph. Præf. 1551.

Ex quâ Rob. Stephani de veteri interprete ſententia vulgatum Textum Græcum caſtigandum putavi ex vaticanarum lectionum & veteris verſionis mutuo conſenſu. Toinard, Harm. Evan. 1709.

[b] Exemplar ipſum quod attinet; deſcriptum eſt literis, &c. in quibus ſedulò à ſcriptore cautum eſt, ut Græca & Latina ſibi invicem reſponderent, verbum fere verbo, ſervato plerumque eodem ipſo verborum ordine. Mill. Proleg. p. 182.

Retento eodem verborum quantumcunque tranſpoſitorum ordine. Id. p. 133.

of it; tho' he tells us and ſhews us all along in *his Prolegomena* [*a*] *that he paid the utmoſt Veneration to it, and valued every tatter'd Fragment of it like old Gold.*

But tho' *former Editors*, as I have ſaid, ſpeak ſo much of the *cloſe Adherence of the Vulgate to the Greek*, yet they knew withal *how far* this Harmony extended; and ſhew us plainly, that it was ſo far from *following the Words ſo ſcrupulouſly and ſuperſtitiouſly*, as if *the Order of them were a Myſtery*; that it often *departed from them*; ſometimes *wantonly* and *without Reaſon*; in re ludicrâ quasì laſciviens & oſcitans. Mr. *Martin* tells us [*b*], *that as to the admirable Agreement, which our Editor pretends to have found amongſt his Manuſcripts, in the Places he has compared; he can aſſure him without Raſhneſs, that he will find ſeveral others, wherein he'll find Difference enough*; which I ſhewed likewiſe from the Obſervation of *Eraſmus*, *Arias Montanus*, and *Beza.*

But here † *our Editor* comes over us again, with his *old fetch*; † p. 24. *What Greek? What Vulgate* was this they talk of? As for thoſe *recent*, *interpolated*, *ſcoundril*, *ſcrub Manuſcripts*, which *they ſaw and uſed*, and *which our Maſter would ſcorn to look into, they will differ from our Maſter's Greek and Vulgate in thouſands of Places.* But he forgets ſure, that of the *four very old Manuſcripts*, which he had appealed to in the *very laſt Page*, *Beza* had uſed *two at leaſt*, and *the moſt conſiderable of them*; *one of which* he made a Preſent of to *the Univerſity of Cambridge.* As for *Eraſmus* and the *other Editors*, they have all given us Accounts of ſome *Manuſcripts* they uſed, of the *moſt venerable Antiquity*, which the Learned have not been able to find out to this Day; and as it is probable, that *ſome of them* may have been *loſt*; ſo neither is it unlikely, that *others*, after having *lain neglected* and *buried* for many Years in Obſcurity, may have been *retrieved* and *produced* again into the World under the Notion of a *new Diſcovery.*

[*a*] *Veterem* Novi Teſtamenti *Italicam* ſummâ veneratione proſequimur, ejuſque vel ſemeſa fragmenta auro contrà non cara ducimus. Mill. Proleg. p. 142. Reſtat jam ipſius Hieronymi inſpiciamus Exemplar. Ibid. p. 81.

[*b*] Defence of Diſſertat. Engliſh.

But we need not trouble our ſelves, as I have ſaid in *my Remarks*, with *producing Evidence* in a Caſe ſo clear; for *his own Specimen* effectually overthrows *his Hypotheſis*; where, in the *Latin Text*, as dreſſed up by himſelf, we ſee *many conſiderable Variations* in *the Order of Words from the Greek*, as *v.* 2, 5, 8,
* p. 24. 9, 12, *&c.* This *our Editor* calls * a *Specimen of the greateſt Malice and Impudence, that ever Scribler out of the dark committed to Paper.* But let him *rave* as much as he pleaſes; I am ſo far from ſeeing any Reaſon to change my Mind, that I ſtill inſiſt, that *theſe very Variations* are a ſufficient *Confutation of his Notion*; and with *theſe* I will undertake to ſhew, that *the Account* which *other Editors* have given of *the old Verſion is juſt and true*; whilſt *his own is falſe and ridiculous.* Dr. *Mill* ſays [a], *of this Verſion, that in this Book of the* Revelations *it is very accurate, and almoſt every where follows the Greek cloſely at the Heels, unleſs where it is proper to change the Tenſes of the Verbs.* *Our Editor* on the other
† p. 20. hand ſays, † that St. *Jerom*, who reformed *this Verſion*, believed *the Order of Words to be a Myſtery; which he obſerved therefore in his Latin moſt religiouſly, not daring to vary a Tittle from it.* The Queſtion is, which of theſe Characters *is true?* And it may eaſily be decided *by an Appeal to the Specimen.* For inſtance, τȣ̃ ϖοταμȣ̃ ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐντεῦθεν, *v.* 2.] is rendred in *the Latin, ex utraque parte fluminis.* Here we ſee, *the Verſion* is very *accurate* as to *the Senſe*, but makes *very free* with *the Order of Words.* *Our*
* p. 24. *Editor* ſays *, *it could not be tranſlated otherwiſe, without a Barbariſm.* But what's that to the Purpoſe, in a *Verſion* which is allowed to abound *in Barbariſms?* If it had been rendred, *fluminis hinc & hinc*; it would have been as intelligible, and even as *good Latin* as *many other Places*, that might be produced; but

---

[a] In Apocalypſi, verſio admodùm accurata erat, ipſiſque Textûs Græci veſtigiis ubique ferè κατὰ ϖόδας inſiſtebat, niſi cum ſeries narrationis exigerent, ut mutarentur verborùm tempora. Mill. Proleg.

if it muſt needs be *ex utraque parte*; why ſhould not *fluminis* be put *before* rather than *behind*, to correſpond the better with the *Greek in a Point ſo ſacred?*

Ὡς τὸ ἔργον ἐςὶν αὐτȣ̃, *v.* 12.] is in the Latin, *ſecundum opera ſua.* Here we ſee *the Verſion* preſerving ſtill the *Senſe*, but regarding neither the *Words nor Order of Words.* But *our Editor* tells † us again, that this could not poſſibly be helped, *for it muſt* † p. 24. *have been very aukward to have tranſlated otherwiſe*; as if *Myſteries* were to be given up *for Trifles.* A Page or two ago, St. *Jerom* was defending *aukward Latin*, for fear of loſing a *Tittle of Senſe*; but now the *Tables are turned*, and he muſt needs *profane Myſteries*, for *fear of writing aukwardly.* But what is moſt ſurpriſing, is to find *our Editor* roundly affirming, that in *theſe two Inſtances* there is not *the leaſt Variation*, nor *any breach of Order at all*; and yet but *three Lines* after he calls it, *a judicious Change of the whole*; ſurely *no Man but himſelf* could have ſuch a Contempt for his Readers as to think to put them off with ſuch *ſhuffling*, *ſenſeleſs*, *incoherent Stuff* as this.

He is forced however at laſt to own, * that there are *two De-* * p. 25. *viations from the Order of Words*, as ȣ̓κ ἔςαι ἔτι, *v.* 5.] *ultra non erit*, for *non erit ultra*; and τȣ̃ δεικνύοντος μοι ταῦτα, *v.* 8.] *qui mihi hæc oſtendebat*, inſtead of *oſtendentis mihi hæc.* But theſe he laughs at, as *too trifling* to deſerve *any Regard* or *Conſideration*; and ſo far I agree with him, that *the Alterations* are indeed *very trifling*; and that it would be impertinent to take notice of them on any Account but this, where it happens, that the *more inconſiderable* they are, the more effectually they ſhew the *Abſurdity of his Notion*; for if St. *Jerom believed the Order of Words to be a Myſtery*; would he *violate that Myſtery* for a Trifle, for nothing at all? If he believed it a *Point of Religion*, to ſtick to *the very Order of Words*, would he have departed from it *in meer Wantonneſs*, without *the leaſt Pretence* in the World for it? A Man, one would think, muſt be infatuated, that would reaſon ſo *abſurdly* and *inconſiſtently*.

As for *the other two Inſtances* I referred to, my Meaning was to ſhew by them a *verbal Variation from the Greek*, which is as much againſt his Scheme as *if the Order were changed*; for he promiſes, that *Jerom*'s *Latin* is to *agree with the Greek*, as well in the *very Words* as *the Order*. And yet for all his Reflection upon *my & cætera*, I can produce many more Examples of this kind in *his Specimen*, as ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα, *v.* 20.] is in *the Latin*, *qui teſtimonium perhibet iſtorum*; and can any Man call this *tranſlating verbally*, or *adhering religiouſly to the Words?* Nay, is it not juſt the *contrary, a departing from the Words, as far as is poſſible, without hurting the Senſe?* If the *Tranſlator* had been *ſo ſcrupulous*, as *our Editor* makes him, he muſt neceſſarily have rendred it by, *teſtificans hæc*; which is a Phraſe very common with the *Vulgate Verſion*. Again πᾶς φιλῶν ϗ ποιῶν ψεῦδος, *v.* 15.] muſt, according to *our Editor's Notion*, have been tranſlated, *omnis amans & faciens Mendacium*, and not, *qui amat & facit*; and ἔπεσα προσκυνῆσαι, *v.* 8.] muſt likewiſe have been rendred, *cecidi adorare*; and not, *ut adorarem*; for there are Inſtances in this very Chapter of both theſe kinds of Tranſlation. And now we ſee the Truth of Dr. *Mill*'s *Obſervation*, and the *Extravagance of our Editor's*; *the Verſion* keeps *accurately to the Senſe*; almoſt every where *cloſely to the Words*; and yet *changes ſometimes the Moods and Tenſes of Verbs*, but yet *departs* both from *Words and Order of Words* often enough to convince us, that the *Tranſlator* never dreamt of *any Myſtery* lodged *in either*.

But the Truth and Merit of *this new and noble Thought* may eaſily be brought to a *Trial* and *Experiment* by the Reader; for let him take *the Scraps of Greek* here produced, and with *our Editor's Notion* fixt in his Head, let him ſit down *to tranſlate them* anew, as *exactly* and *agreeably* to it as poſſible; and he will ſoon find it neceſſary in every ſingle Inſtance to give us *other Latin*, than we now ſee in *the Specimen*. Or on the other hand, let him throw aſide *the Greek*, and endeavour to *tranſlate the Latin* back again with *the Notion* of its agreeing *moſt religiouſly and minutely with the Original both in the Words and the Order of* *them*; and he would ſoon find *his Greek* likewiſe appear *very different* from that of the *preſent Text*; he would ſoon find, I ſay, in both theſe Caſes, that *our Editor's Notion*, if purſued exactly, and with ſo *much Streſs*, as is laid upon it, would, inſtead of mending *both Texts*, make them both inſtrumental to *the corrupting* each other.

I had before obſerved *in my Remarks*, how *our Editor's Notion* would naturally lead him *to wreſt* and *force both Texts*, to accommodate them *the better to his Hypotheſis*. This he will needs have to be a *ſtupid* and *ſenſeleſs Calumny*; *confuted even by my ſelf*; for if *he had been diſpoſed*, he ſays, * *to warp his Texts*; he could eaſily have *ſet all the Variations* I have been objecting to him, *in their right Order*, and *have kept his own Counſel*. We ſee what an Opinion he has *of the Senſe amd Abilities of Mankind*; there's *no Sagacity*, *no Judgment*, *no Obſervation in any Man but himſelf*; we have nothing but *his great Integrity* to truſt to for the *Genuineneſs of our Scriptures*. 'Tis but *keeping his own Counſel*, and he could put upon us *what Text he pleaſes*, and the Chriſtian World be never the wiſer. But for all the Appeal he here makes *to his great Fidelity*, the Reader may eaſily obſerve *in his Specimen*, what *a Byaſs and Prejudice* there is upon him from the Influence *of this Notion of his*; for as to *the Greek Text*, he does not ſcruple to *make it bend to the Latin* upon the Credit of a *ſingle Manuſcript*; and often changes it, where his *main Authority* is fetch'd from *the Conſent of the Latin Copies*, v. 5, &c. And *for the Latin*, he is ſtill leſs ſcrupulous; making it *comply with the Greek*, ſometimes, as he owns, *contrary to the greateſt Part of the Manuſcript*, v. 5. ſometimes *contrary to all the Manuſcripts he ever ſaw*, v. 3. *This Agreement of the two Texts*, he calls, * *as plain and cogent a Reaſon for altering them, as any Authority*. And it is not enough for him, we find, † *to reſtore the Text to Truth and Certainty*, except it be *reſtored to Order too*. And what elſe is this but *putting a Force*, as I ſaid, *upon both Texts*, the better to make good *his own Hypotheſis*?

In the Cloſe of *my Remarks* on this *ſecond Paragraph*, I had

* p. 2.

* P. 37.

† P. 32.

obſerved, that *our Editor in a Sermon preached ſome time ago at Cambridge*, and ſince printed, had ſpoken of the *vulgar Latin* in a Stile *very different* from what he uſes at preſent; and I took Occaſion there to ſhew, as an Inſtance of his *great Skill* and *Knowledge* in *the Controverſy* he was then handling; how in the *Face of an Univerſity*, and in a *ſtudied, laboured Diſcourſe upon the Errors of Popery*, he betrayed a *profound Ignorance* of what the *Church of* Rome *maintained*, or *the Council of* Trent *had decreed in reſpect to the Vulgate Verſion*; and *blunder'd along* with *the common Herd of Writers*, about *their enhancing the Stream above the Fountain*; *the Tranſlation above the Original*; *the corrupt Latin of an unknown Author, above the inſpired Greek.* All which *Stuff* can ſerve for nothing elſe, but to make us *contemptible to the Papiſts*; having been *ſo often confuted*, and *ſo conſtantly diſclaimed* by all their *beſt Writers.*

But he has thought fit to take no other Notice of this Charge, than by repaying my Compliment *in kind*, and anſwering me * *with a Blunder of my own*; for having told us, *in this Sermon of his, that more ancient Manuſcripts are preſerved of the Greek than of the Latin.* I was ſilly enough, it ſeems, to miſtake it for *more in Number*; whereas he meant onely *more in Degree*; that is, *ancienter.* For tho', ſays he, * *there are four or five Greek Manuſcripts, older than any Latin one*; *yet for thoſe of a thouſand Years old, there are twenty Latin ones preſerved for one Greek.* We ſee here, that *Manuſcripts of a thouſand Years old* are nothing at all with him; he talks as familiarly of them, as if they were to be found in every Bookſeller's Shop. He told us not long ago † of *eight Greek Manuſcripts*, he had by him, of *above a thouſand Years old*; and if there was not *one more* in Being than *theſe eight*, yet that would raiſe the Number of *his Latin ones to eight Score*, which I am ſure, modeſtly ſpeaking, is at *leaſt ten times more*, than are now *known to be extant in all the World. Jac. le Long*, a *learned Father of the Oratory*, and *Library-keeper at Paris*, after a *moſt curious* and *diligent* Enquiry among the *beſt Authors*, and *Libraries of Europe*, could not find ſo much as *one Manuſcript*

of

* p. 27.

* Ibid.

† p. 13.

of St. Jerom's *vulgar Latin,* which appeared *certainly* and *undoubtedly* to be *a thouſand Years old*; as we ſee in *the Catalogue,* he has printed, of *an hundred of the beſt and oldeſt of them, now known in the World, with Critical and Hiſtorical Notes* upon each. He tells us, as I find him quoted alſo by Mr. *Martin,* (p. 14.) *that he found none older than* Theodulphus, *who was an Abbot, and Biſhop of* Orleans *about* A. D. 790. *He mentions another of the Year* 795. *and a Third of which he doubts a little, in a Monaſtery of the* Ciſtercians, *which is reputed to be a thouſand Years old.* But this is another Inſtance of *the Livelineſs of our Editor's Imagination*; and ſhews that *Father Amelote* was really but a Novice to him.

Paragraph the Third.

The Author believes, that he has retrieved (except in very few Places) the true Exemplar of Origen, *which was the Standard to the moſt Learned of the* Fathers, *at the time of the Council of* Nice *and two Centuries after. And he is ſure, That the* Greek *and* Latin *Manuſcripts, by their mutual Aſſiſtance, do ſo ſettle the Original Text to the ſmalleſt Nicety, as cannot be performed now in any* Claſſic *Author whatever: and that out of a Labyrinth of Thirty Thouſand Various Readings, that crowd the Pages of our preſent beſt Editions, all put upon equal Credit to the Offence of many good Perſons; this Clue ſo leads and extricates us, that there will ſcarce be two Hundred out of ſo many Thouſands that can deſerve the leaſt Conſideration.*

REMARKS.

In my *former Remarks on this Paragraph,* I had ſaid, that *the Account, our Editor here gives of* Origen's *Exemplar, which he pretends to have retrieved, ſeemed to be a groundleſs Fancy, or Miſtake of his own*; and I ſupported my Opinion with many good Reaſons and Authorities, which I need not now repeat. *Our Editor* however is reſolved, we ſee, at all Adventures to ſtick to his Point; and growing onely more deſperate by Oppoſition, *advances ſtill* and *riſes* in his Aſſertion, *ut ex frontis duritiâ fidem lectori faceret, & quod impudenter ſcriberet, verè ſcribere judicaretur.*

tar. Hier. For *Origen*'s *Exemplar*, which was before a *Standard onely to the moſt Learned of the Fathers*, is now declared to have been *received as ſuch* * by both *Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches*. Nay, he now tells us the very *Circumſtances* and *Manner* of *Origen*'s *compoſing it*, as if he had ſtood all the while at his Elbow, or had been as *intimate* with him as *once with Dr. Mill*; for *he gathered*, he aſſures us †, *from all Parts the Exemplars of the beſt Note*; *examined* and *collated them*; and *by thoſe Helps ſettled the genuine Text*, juſt as he himſelf, and *other good Critics* would do, even at *this Day*. Yet all this *formal Story* will be found at laſt, to be *pure Invention* of his own, without any *Reality* or *Foundation* in *Truth* or *Hiſtory*; and I may venture without any Scruple to affirm, that there is not the *leaſt Ground or Authority* for it in *all Antiquity*.

* p. 30.

† Ibid.

The firſt Argument I ſhall produce for this Opinion of mine (which I take to be a very concluſive one) is what I have met with and borrowed from *Origen himſelf*, who tells us in his *Commentaries* upon *Matthew* (c. xix. v. 19.) *that he believes this Sentence*, *ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σοῦ ὡς σεαυτὸν*, *thou ſhall love thy Neighbour as thy ſelf*] to have been an *Interpolation* or *Addition* made to *the Text* by ſome *Copyer*; for which he gives very good Reaſons; but does not, *as Criticks do now*, produce the *Authority of any particular Manuſcript* to ſupport his Conjecture. *It would be impious*, ſays he, *to aſſert ſuch a Paſſage as this to be interpolated, if we did not know the great Difference there is in the ſeveral Copies of the New Teſtament, cauſed either by the Negligence, Ignorance*, or *Raſhneſs* of *Tranſcribers*. *This Evil*, continues he, [a] *we have, by God's Aſſiſtance, remedied, as far as concerns the Old Teſtament, by making uſe of its ſeveral Editions as the Rule of judging by*. Here we ſee *Origen* is treating expreſly of *the Corruptions*, which were found in the *Copies of the New Teſtament*; and if he had made it his Buſineſs to *have corrected* and *reformed them*, and out of *them all* to have *gathered* and *ſettled the genuine, authentic*

---

[a] Τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωνίαν, θεοῦ διδόντος, εὕρομεν ἰάσασθαι, κριτηρίῳ χρησάμενοι ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐκδόσεσιν. Orig. Comm. in Mat. p. 381. ex Edit. Huet.

authentic Text, as *our Editor* affirms, it would have been here *very proper*, nay *very neceſſary* to have given us ſome Account of it; but inſtead of that, he tells us, *that he took this Pains onely in the Old Teſtament*, without any mention, either *here* or *any where elſe*, that he ever did the *ſame in the New*.

Euſebius, who was a *zealous Apologiſt for* Origen, has not given the *leaſt Hint* of it, in *his Hiſtory* of thoſe Times; tho' he has left us a very large Account of the *Merits of this Great Man*. He tells us, with what *incredible Induſtry* he applied himſelf to *the Study of the Scriptures* [a], and *what numerous Volumes of Commentaries he wrote upon moſt of the Books of Sacred Writ*; what *Pains he took in publiſhing his celebrated Work called* Hexapla; where his Diligence was chiefly employed in *correcting* and *amending the Edition of the Septuagint*: But he ſays not *one Word* of any *critical Pains* he took upon *the Text of the New Teſtament*; or of any *famous Exemplar* he left of it; but inſtead of that, acquaints us, *that he did not receive ſome of its Books as Canonical*.

Ruffinus, who tranſlated moſt of *his Works* into *Latin*, and *wrote an Apology* for him, has not taken the leaſt Notice of any *ſuch correct Exemplar* of his, as is here pretended.

St. *Jerom*, who was a *great Admirer of* Origen's *Parts and Learning*, is very particular in the frequent account he gives *of his Hexapla*; yet ſays not *one Word* to make us believe that he ever *attempted or effected any Critical Edition of the New Teſtament*, or left *any Copy* of it behind him ſo famous *for its Correctneſs*, as to become a *Standard to any Body*; and as *to the Edition of the Septuagint*, exhibited in *his Hexapla*, where he had placed moſt of his Pains and Skill, he often tells us [b], *that different Countries uſed different Copies even of that: For* Alexandria *and* Ægypt, ſays he, *followed the Edition of* Heſychius: Conſtantinople *as far as* Antioch, *preferred that of* Julian *the Martyr*; *and the Provinces between theſe two read* Origen's *Copies, which* Euſebius *and* Pamphilus *publiſhed.* So that his *moſt celebrated, admired* and *critical Work, his Edition of the old Scriptures,* inſtead of *being a Standard to the whole Chriſtian World,* was onely received *as ſuch* in a *ſmall Corner of it,* hardly beyond the *Confines of Palæſtine.*

---

[a] Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. cap. 25. l. 6.

[b] Nunc cum pro varietate regionum diverſa ferantur Exemplaria, & antiqua illa tranſlatio corrupta ſit, &c. Alexandria & Ægyptus in Septuaginta ſuis Heſychium laudat autorem. Conſtantinopolis uſque Antiochiam Juliani Martyris Exemplaria probat. Mediæ inter has Provinciæ Palæſtinos Codices legunt, quos ab origine elaboratos Euſebius & Pamphilus vulgaverunt. Hier. Præf. in lib. Paralipom.

St. *Jerom* lived at *Bethlehem,* in this *very Country,* where he made a *Collection of* Origen's *Works*; in order to uſe him as a *Commentator,* and not as a *Critic*; for he condemns [*a*] *his very Edition of the Septuagint, as corrupted rather than mended by him*; and when he was reproached as an Admirer of his Notions, *I praiſed in him,* ſays he [*b*], *the Commentator, and not the Author of Opinions*; *his Parts not his Faith*; *the Philoſopher not the Apoſtle:* and in another Place, he ſays [*c*], *that it was in his Tomes or Volumes of Commentaries that he ſpread the full Sails of his Wit and Parts to the blowing Winds.* St. *Jerom,* whoſe chief Employment was *writing Commentaries upon the Scriptures,* made it his Buſineſs to collect *all the Commentators* whatſoever, who were of any Note, or admired in the Church, and *Origen* among the reſt, to whom he often gives the Preference. He tells us [*d*], *that he abounded in many different Editions of the ſacred Writings*; and when he was charged with following *Origen*'s *Opinions,* he excuſes himſelf by ſaying [*e*], *I have collected his Books, I confeſs,* but *wiſh that I had the Volumes of all the Writers of this kind.* And again, *it is the Duty,* ſays he [*f*], *of a Commentator to give the Opinions of many Writers*; and *for that Reaſon I have alſo given*

[*a*] Epiſt. ad Auguſt.

[*b*] Laudavi interpretem non Dogmatiſten; ingenium non fidem; Philoſophum non Apoſtolum. Id. ad Pam.

[*c*] Ille inſcripſit Tomos, nos volumina;—in quo opere tota ingenii ſui vela ſpirantibus ventis dedit. Id. ad Vincen. Preſb.

[*d*] Et quoniam, largiente Domino, multis ſacræ Bibliothecæ Codicibus abundamus. Id. ad Flor.

[*e*] Congregavi libros ejus, fateor, &c. Utinam omnium Tractatorum haberem volumina. Id. ad Pamm. & Ocean.

[*f*] Commentatoris officium multorum ſententias ponere, etiam Origenis explanationem poſui. Id. cont. Ruff. l. 1.

the Explication of Origen. And in the *ſame Book* he ſays [a], *in my Commentaries on the* Epheſians, *I have followed* Origen, *and* Didymus, *and* Apollinarius, *(who all certainly hold Opinions contrary to each other) in ſuch a Manner, that I might not loſe the true Faith.* In theſe Commentaries which he had collected there might very probably be added or interwoven *a Copy of the Text*, which each Author followed; and it muſt be allowed likewiſe, that *Origen* here and there *occaſionally interſperſed ſome Critical Notes and Obſervations upon the different Readings of the ſeveral Exemplars he had met with.* And this will lead us to the true Meaning and Explication of *thoſe two Paſſages of St. Jerom*, which *our Editor* has brought, * as the *ſole Authority* and *Foundation* of his Aſſer- * p. 29.
tion; both which he borrowed onely from Dr. *Mill* [b], and tho' he pretends ſo much to deſpiſe his Authority, yet was plainly led by it into *this unhappy Blunder*, by the Doctor's having laid more ſtreſs upon *theſe Paſſages* than they will be found able to bear; and what makes it clear, that he looked no farther than *the Doctor's Prolegomena*, is, that beſides theſe *two Citations*, he mentions here *a third*, which he found alſo in the ſame Place, about *the Collation of* Origen's *Copies at Cæſaræa*, with telling us where to look for it *in St. Jerom*, becauſe *Dr. Mill himſelf* had neglected to inform us, where he found it. As to the two Paſſages here produced, the firſt is in *this Father's Commentaries on Matthew (c. 24.)* where he ſpeaks [c] *of a Reading found in the Latin Copies which was not in the Greek ones, eſpecially thoſe of* Origen *and* Pierius. The *ſecond* is in *his Commentaries on* Galatians (*c.* 3.) where he ſays [d], *that he omitted to ſay any thing upon an Expreſſion there mentioned, becauſe it was omitted in* Origen's *Copies.* And now, what does *our Editor* gather from *theſe two Paſſages?* Why *his*

---

[a] Ego in Commentariis ad Epheſios ſic Origenem, & Dydimum, & Apollinarium ſequutus ſum (qui certè contraria inter ſe habent dogmata) ut fidei meæ non amitterem veritatem. Id. ibid.

[b] Vid. Mill. Prolegom. p. 64.

[c] In quibuſdam *Latinis* codicibus additum eſt, *neque Filius*: cum in *Græcis* & maximè *Adamantii* & *Pierii* Exemplaribus, hoc non habeatur adſcriptum.

[d] Sed hoc quia in *Adamantii* Exemplaribus non habetur *omiſimus.*

Concluſion is, that *Origen*'s *Exemplar of the New Teſtament was a Standard to the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches,* that is, *the whole Chriſtian World*; and yet *the Premiſſes* imply nothing more, than that St. *Jerom* made uſe of *Origen*, amongſt *other Commentators*; ſometimes following *one*, and ſometimes *another*. For the *firſt of theſe Inſtances* will prove full as well that *Pierius*'s *Exemplar was a Standard*, as *that of Origen*; ſince *both of them* are put exactly upon *the Level*; and *the ſecond* onely ſhews, that *Origen* was there preferred to the *reſt of the Commentators:* For tho' St. *Jerom* made uſe, as I have ſhewn, of *ſeveral of them* in other Books; yet he tells us [*a*], that *he followed* Origen *alone in this*; and it was but neceſſary therefore for him *to omit* the ſaying any thing upon *ſuch Paſſages*, as *Origen himſelf* had left out of his Copy, or had neglected *to take notice of*.

Among all the *Modern Writers* who are allowed to be the *moſt knowing in Antiquity*, and the *beſt Judges* of the *Point in queſtion*, there is not the *leaſt Notion* that *Origen* left behind him *any Exemplar* of the *New Teſtament*, which was received afterwards as a *Standard*.

Neither *Du Pin* in his *Life of Origen*, nor Monſ. *Tillemont*, who has written ſtill more *largely* and *particularly* about him, has given us any Hint about it, but tells us onely the *old Story of his Hexapla and his Commentaries*, and how the great Reputation he acquired *by theſe*, drew many Strangers from all Parts to viſit him.

The *Learned Huetius* (in his long and elaborate Treatiſe called *Origeniana*, prefixed to his *Edition of* Origen'*s Commentaries)* has collected all that *Antiquity* and *the Fathers* have delivered *of Origen*'s *Writings and Opinions*; with a particular Hiſtory of all who *favoured*, or *declared againſt him*, whether *Churches* or *private Perſons*; yet he gives us no Reaſon to imagine that *his Copy of the New Teſtament* was taken notice of any where after his Death as a

---

[*a*] Imbecillitatem virium mearum ſentiens Origenis Commentarios ſum ſequutus. Id. Præf. ad Galatas.

Standard of *the genuine Text* ; but on the contrary, that [a] *his Induſtry was chiefly celebrated for explaining the Myſteries of the Old Teſtament* ; and *that* [b] *he did not ſtick to any one Edition, but uſed ſeveral* ; and *often quoted the Spurious and Apocryphal Goſpel to the* Hebrews, *as St.* Jerom *himſelf aſſures* [c] *us.*

M. *Simon* [d] indeed ſpeaks very roundly to *the preſent Subject*, and affirms *directly that* Origen *never did what our Editor here declares him to have done* ; that is, *leave any Examplar of the New Teſtament as a Standard of the Genuine Text to the Church. He corrected*, he tells us, *the Edition of the Septuagint, according to the common Rules of Criticiſm* ; *but did nothing like it in the New Teſtament :* For *the Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, ſays he, [e] *who lived after him, never take the leaſt Notice of two Sorts of Editions of the New Teſtament, as they do always of the Old*, viz. *the common one, and the other corrected by* Origen. He owns indeed, *that he collected with Care the beſt Copies of his Time, and made ſome Critical Reflections upon ſeveral Places of them as Occaſion offered* ; *yet it does not at all appear*, he ſays [f], *that what he did of this Kind ever ſerved as a Law or Standard in regard to the New Teſtament, as it did in reſpect to the Septuagint of the Old* ; *for if this had been ſo, then we ſhould have had*, continues he [g], *a kind of* Mazora *for the Text of the New Teſtament, as the* Jews *have for that of the Old*,

---

[a] In evolvendis præcipuè *Priſci Fœderis* myſteriis laudata ſit ipſius induſtria. Huet.

[b] Non *eâdem Editione* in iis interpretandis uſus eſt. Ibid.

[c] Utebatur ſæpenumerò Adamantius *Evangelio ſecundum Hebræos*. Hier. de Scriptor. Eccleſias in Jacobum.

[d] Vid. Crit. Hiſt. of the N. T. v. 1. p. 337.

[e] Mais il n'a rien fait de ſemblable ſur les livre de Nouveau Teſtament auſſi ne voyons nous point, que les Ecrivains Eccleſiaſtiques, qui ont vêcu apres Origene, ayent diſtinguè deux ſortes d'Editions du Nouveau Teſtament, comme ils ont diſtinguè deux Editions de la Verſion des ſeptante. Ibid.

[f] Mais il ne nous paroit point, que ſa Critique ait ſervi de loy au regard a ces livres, comme au regard a l'ancienne Verſion Grecque du vieux Teſtament, ſi cela etoit arrivè, nous aurions eu.

[g] Une Maſſore du Texte Grec des Evangeliſtes, & des Apôtres, de la meme maniere, que les Juifs en ont une du Texte Ebreu, &c. Ibid.

and the Church would have acquieſced in Origen's *Text, as the others do in that of their* Mazorites.

Dr. *Mill* makes it evident and certain in *his Prolegomena*, that *the Copies of the New Teſtament*, which *Origen* made uſe of, were *corrupted* and *interpolated*, (which may be gathered likewiſe from St. *Jerom* himſelf) and he ſhews withal, that he was not *curious* or *exact* in his *Citations of the Scripture, but often truſted to his Memory, and made uſe of various Editions, as he happened to have them at hand, and ſometimes quoted the ſame Paſſage very differently*; and it is hardly credible, that he ſhould leave a *Standard of the genuine Text to the Church*, who never had any *certain* or *particular Exemplar* of his own, which he made *a Standard to himſelf.*

But ſhould we allow *our Editor*, for Argument's ſake, that *Origen* did leave behind him ſuch a *Copy of the New Teſtament* as he pretends, there is ſtill *another Difficulty* to be got over, *another Queſtion* to be reſolved, *viz. how this ſame Copy can now be retrieved by any Man at this Diſtance?* The onely Way now left of coming at *any Reading* of *Origen*, is by *collecting* all the *ſcatter'd Paſſages of Scripture*, which are to be found in *his Works*, as well as *all other Citations* of them, borrowed from him by any of the *Eccleſiaſtical Writers*; but let him ſearch as diligently as he pleaſes, *all theſe Paſſages*, when drawn together, cannot poſſibly make out *the fiftieth part of an Exampler of the New Teſtament.* Moſt of *Origen*'s *Works* have been *loſt* many Centuries ago; and a *great Part* of what remains of him is preſerved onely *in Tranſlations* made chiefly *by Ruffinus*, who *altered*, *abridged* and *uſed* them with a great deal of *Freedom*, as he himſelf owns, which gave Occaſion to *Eraſmus* to ſay [*a*], *that we hardly know any thing more of* Origen *now, than that in ſome things he was erroneous.* So that *this Notion of retrieving his very Exemplar*, muſt needs appear *ridiculous*, *abſurd*, and *little* better than a *Contradiction in Terms.*

But let us allow him ſtill farther, that *this Exemplar is even*

[*a*] Ac penè nihil novimus Origenis, niſi quòd in quibuſdam erraverit. Eraſm. in ſcript. Eccl. Hieron.

retrievable; theſe are ſtill but *previous Points*; *the Merits* of the Cauſe lie in a *Queſtion of meer Fact*, viz. *Whether he has actually retrieved it or no*; and this can only be determined by an Examination of *the Proof* or *Inſtances* he has given us of it *in his Specimen.*

And here I have obſerved, that he has produced in his Notes *no more than three various Readings from Origen*; and inſtead of *recovering* or *retrieving any Part even of theſe, he has thrown them all aſide as falſe.* This without doubt muſt needs appear *very ſtrange* to the Reader; but yet the Excuſe he here makes for it will, I dare ſay, ſeem much more *ſurpriſing:* For to ſolve *this Inconſiſtency*, he tells us, * *that theſe were not the true Readings of* Origen, *but ſuch as had been vitiated and corrupted by the Tranſcribers of his Works*; *not the Words of the Father, but of the Copyers of the Father.* To what Purpoſe then were they at all mentioned or alledged by him? It is his Duty to produce onely the *known* and *allowed* Readings of the *ancient Writers*; much leſs, *ſuch onely*, as he knows *to have never belonged to them.* Is this the Way *of retrieving a true Exemplar*, by preſenting us with nothing more of it, than what he owns to be *ſpurious?* Would *any Editor in his Senſes* have quoted onely *the corrupted Paſſages* of an Author, even *contrary to his own Emendations*; if he had known of *any true and genuine ones*, that would have *confirmed* and *eſtabliſhed them?* *our Critic* has here plainly *overſhot himſelf*, and while he thought it ſo eaſie to make *a Fool of his Reader*, by carrying *the Jeſt too far*, has made a *Fool onely of himſelf.* I charged him with *being inconſiſtent*, in having given us *ſo little of Origen*; and he defends himſelf by proving, that he has really *given us nothing at all.* Thus, we ſee, that all this Noiſe he has been making *about Origen*, is but *another Flouriſh of his Rhetorick*; a *meer Banter*, and *Impoſition* upon the World; and *he*, who pretends here to *ſell us* Origen's *genuine Exemplar*, will be found to mean nothing more than *the Man*, who *mounts a Stage* with *Hippocrates*'s *genuine Balſam*; *the one* is juſt *as quackiſh in Divinity*, as *the other* is in *Phyſick.*

* p. 31.

As for the *reſt of this Paragraph,* it is hardly worth while to give my ſelf any further Trouble about it; ſince *our Editor* has not offered the leaſt thing *material,* againſt what I have already *remarked* upon it. I charged him *with contradicting both himſelf and common Senſe,* in making *that* a Ground of *Offence* againſt *Dr. Mill's Edition,* which he had before proved to be *its Advantage and Recommendation*; and when he had ſhewn *this very Offence* to be moſt *impertinent and ridiculous.* I obſerved, how he had made himſelf *very merry* [a] *with Dr.* Whitby*'s Fears*; *with his greater Zeal than Knowledge*; *and his Concern for the Text, without knowing the Meaning of the Word*; and had expoſed likewiſe the *Cavils of the Sceptics, at the great Number of various Readings, which we ſee in that very Edition*; but the *confuting of Freethinkers,* we may fancy perhaps to have been an *eaſie Taſk*; but what ſhall we ſay to him now when he has *confuted even himſelf?* For now he will needs fetch us *back again,* and make us believe that *the Learned* * *Dr. Whitby* had ſurely Reaſon *to be alarm'd*; that *the Panic ſeized the greater Part of the Clergy*; *the poor Churchmen were terrified*; *the Atheiſts carried all before them,* and had gained in a manner a compleat Victory; and yet, I dare ſay, there is *not an Atheiſt or Sceptic of them all,* that does not triumph more at *this Day,* than they have done for *ſome Years paſt,* to hear that the *ſacred Text* is under *the Correction of his Hand*; and not *one of them,* but would much ſooner *ſubſcribe for an Edition of it from him,* than from *any other Critic* in Chriſtendom.

* p. 32.

If indeed we were ſtill in the dark upon the Subject of *theſe various Lections*; and could onely amuſe our ſelves *in general,* about the *ſtrange Difference of the ſeveral Copies of the New Teſtament,* if we could talk onely in the Lump *of thirty thouſand various and contrary Readings of the ſacred Text* which the Learned had diſcovered; this indeed might be ſufficient *to alarm,* and *offend many good Perſons,* who had not been converſant in this kind of Knowledge. But ſince Dr. *Mill* has brought *them all* out into *the Light*; and has ſet *the whole Number* before us in *one clear View*; it is impoſſible that they ſhould any longer either be *formidable to the Chriſtian*, or *ſerviceable to the Atheiſt*; and they are now ſo far from giving any *juſt* Matter *of Offence*, that they muſt neceſſarily *take it away*; and *the Church* muſt always owe *this Service to the Doctor*; that her Friends as well as Enemies muſt now be convinced, that *all theſe Differences*, ſo much talked of, conſiſt onely in *meer Trifles and Niceties, of no Moment, Significancy*, or *Influence as to the Senſe of Scripture*; and that as *our Editor himſelf* has declared [a], *no one Article of Faith, or even Moral Precept is either loſt or perverted in all the thirty thouſand, chuſe as aukwardly as you will, chuſe the worſt by Deſign.* But after all, what a *Piece of Grimace* is it, to charge Dr. *Mill* with *crowded Pages*; with *Offence taken at the Number and undiſtinguiſhed Authority of his Readings*, when, as I have before proved from his *own Specimen*, the charge is much *more juſt againſt himſelf* in all theſe very ſame Inſtances?

---

[a] Rem. on Freethink. part 1. p. 61.

Paragraph the Fourth.

To confirm the Lections which the Author places in the Text, he makes uſe of the old Verſions, Syriac, Coptic, Gothic *and* Æthiopic, *and of all the Fathers*, Greeks *and* Latins, *within the firſt Five Centuries*; *and he gives in his Notes all the various Readings (now known) within the ſaid five Centuries. So that the Reader has under one View what the firſt Ages of the Church knew of the Text*; *and what has crept into any Copies ſince, is of no Value or Authority.*

REMARKS.

Our Editor tells us here, that I have given him but *very little Trouble*, for *I predict onely*, he ſays, † *that his Edition will fall* † p. 35.

---

[a] Rem. on Freethink. part 1. p. 61, &c.

ſhort of former ones, which he will leave to the Edition it ſelf to anſwer; and I wonder he did not *hit upon this Anſwer* much ſooner; for if he had taken the ſame Courſe in all the *other Paragraphs*, he might have ſaved himſelf not onely a good deal of *Pains*, but all that *Ignominy* which *the Malice* as well as *Ignorance* of this Defence of his muſt neceſſarily *expoſe* him to.

As for the *Edition it ſelf*, I have never pretended *to predict*, as he calls it, any thing at all about it, but what riſes naturally and neceſſarily from his *own Account* and *Deſcription of it*. I have undertaken onely to ſhew, that if it *be like its Picture*, which *he himſelf* has preſented to the Publick, it muſt needs be a *bungling*, *uſeleſs*, and *contemptible Performance*; and that particularly, as it is propoſed and deſcribed to us in *this very Paragraph*, it will *fall far ſhort* of what Dr. *Mill* has already executed in *his Edition*.

This I proved from *our Editor's own* Account of what the Doctor had done, compared with what *he* now pretends to in *this Propoſal before us*; and here indeed I have truly *ſaved him ſome Trouble*; having not left him the *leaſt Syllable* to reply to it; the thing is a *Demonſtration*. He promiſes here to make uſe onely of *four Verſions*; whereas Dr. *Mill has actually made uſe of ſeven*: He pretends onely to give *the Readings of five Centuries*; the Doctor has actually produced *the Readings of fifteen*.

† Ibid.

But he takes it † *heinouſly* of me, that I will not allow him to underſtand a *Tittle of the four Verſions* he makes uſe of, and thinks it very hard, that *this Defect* ſhould be charged as a *Reflection* upon him, which was never imputed as ſuch to Dr. *Mill*, *who fairly and frankly profeſſes in his* Prolegomena *that he knew nothing of the Oriental Tongues*. But here we may obſerve, by the Way, the *different Characters* of theſe *two Rival Editors*; *the one* ſcorns to aſſume *any Merit*, which he has not a *juſt Right* and *Title* to; *the other* ſcorns to allow *any Merit* to be in any other Man but *himſelf*: *The one* thinks it becomes him to *confeſs his Ignorance* of what he does not underſtand; *the other* thinks it a *Reflection* to be ſaid to *be ignorant* of any thing. But ſuppoſing *them both* to be entirely equal as to this Point, yet ſurely, I ſay, *ſeven Verſions* muſt always be thought more conſiderable, than *onely four of them:* But he would fain know how I come to be ſo *certain of his Ignorance of all theſe Languages.* This I allow to be a very *reaſonable Queſtion*; and ſhall always be content to be looked upon *as a Libeller*, and expoſed accordingly, whenever I am found *poſitive*, without *very ſufficient Vouchers.* Since therefore he deſires it, I will tell him for once, how I came to know it *ſo certainly.* When I was a *Candidate for a Fellowſhip in his College*, I offered my ſelf to be examined by him *in Hebrew, Chaldee and Syriac*, which at that time I had taken ſome Pains about; but I was much diſappointed to find that he would not undertake *to examine me in any of them*; tho' for a Cover of his Ignorance, he told me then *the ſame Story* he does now, of the *famous Hexapla* he had compoſed, when he was in a Manner but a Boy. Some Years after this, at the Election of *an Hebrew Profeſſor in the Univerſity*, where he was likewiſe a very *active Elector and Examiner*, he never pretended, as I was informed, *to examine the Candidates in the Oriental Languages*; but called onely for a *Pindar to puzzle* them with, as the propereſt Way of trying the Merit of an *Hebrew Profeſſor.* This, I preſume, will be enough to juſtifie what I have ſaid on this Occaſion; and he has not, we ſee, after all, the Courage to deny it directly; having nothing more to ſay for himſelf, than that he underſtood a good deal of the Matter *near forty Years ago.*

I had obſerved likewiſe *in this Paragraph* a direct and evident *Contradiction* between *the Specimen* and *the Propoſals*; for though he promiſes here *to give in his Notes all the known Readings of the five firſt Centuries*, yet he has omitted ſeveral Authorities within *that Period*, which Dr. *Mill* had taken notice of, as *Hilarius*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, v. 2. 5. 14. beſides ſome of the *old Verſions*; and inſtead of *confining himſelf*, as he pretends, to thoſe *firſt Ages of the Church*, he makes as much uſe of ſome Authorities of *inferior Date* as of all the others put together; more particularly *Arethas*, a *Writer of uncertain Age*, who, as all Authors agree, could not *be earlier* than about *the middle of the ſixth Century*, tho' placed by ſome *as low as the tenth*; yet *our Editor* roundly affirms him * *to have flouriſhed in the fourth or fifth. Gregory Palamas*, another of his Authorities, is *truly a modern one of the fourteenth Century*, and *he condeſcends even* to be greatly obliged to *our printed Editions*; to all which he has not thought fit to make the *leaſt Reply* in his Anſwer.

* p. 42.

Paragraph the Fifth.

The Author is very ſenſible, that in the Sacred Writings there's no place for Conjectures or Emendations. Diligence and Fidelity, with ſome Judgment and Experience, are the Characters here requiſite. He declares therefore, that he does not alter one Letter in the Text without the Authorities ſubjoined in the Notes. And to leave the free Choice to every Reader, he places under each Column the ſmalleſt Variations of this Edition, either in Words or Order, from the received Greek *of* Stephanus, *and the* Latin *of the two Popes* Sixtus V. *and* Clemens VIII. *So that this Edition exhibits both it Self, and the Common ones.*

REMARKS.

I have already given the Reader *ſome proper Hints*, how to judge of *our Editor's Pretenſions to the Characters* here given of a *good Scripture-Editor*; but tho' he takes no notice of the reſt, he lays hold however on the Conceſſion I had made, that *his whole Life had been ſpent in Critical Niceties and Grammatical Obſervations on prophane Authors*, and *for this*, he ſays, † *he is the fitter to give an Edition of the New Teſtament*; but I will venture to ſay even *quite the contrary*, that *for this* he is very unfit to give *any Edition* of it at all.

† p. 36.

And here his *old Friend St. Jerom* happens to leave him in the lurch; but that's no Matter, he'll ſay; for he never yet valued any Friend who would not go *thorough Stitch* with him. St. *Jerom*, as we may ſee in the Paſſage of *my Title-page*, tells us a Story of *full as great a Critic as himſelf*, that was *ſo entirely engaged* *ed in the Study of Claſſical Letters, that he knew juſt nothing at all of the Holy Scriptures, and yet like our Editor too, muſt needs be expoſing his Ignorance by prating and meddling with what he did not underſtand. Our Editor*, we know, ſpent above *ten Years* (the beſt and moſt vigorous of his Life) in giving onely an *Edition of Horace*; and what is this, but in the Expreſſion of a *Learned Author*,

> Solido decennio infeliciſſimè & ſine fructu nugari.

For tho' this be the *moſt allowed* and *celebrated Inſtance of his Learning*, yet a great Part of his Time and Pains was employed, as I could eaſily make appear, in *depraving* and *corrupting the Text of his Author*, *for want of underſtanding him:* and the *unwarrantable Freedoms* he has taken with *profane Authors*, will be ſo far from recommending him, that they muſt make all Men of Senſe afraid of *truſting him with the Correction of the Sacred ones*. But let him be never *ſuch an Editor of Claſſics*, yet what's all this to an *Edition of the New Teſtament?* Or, *as St. Jerom* ſays [a], *What has* Horace *to do with the* Pſalms? Virgil *with the* Goſpels? *or* Cicero *with the* Apoſtles? Every body knows what a Difference and Contrariety there is between the *one* and *the other*; not onely in *their Sentiments*, but *in their Stile*, or Manner of expreſſing them; and *an Editor* who ſeems ſo fond of making *the Apoſtles* * ſpeak *pure*, *polite* and *elegant Greek*; whilſt he is intent upon giving us a *correct Text*, muſt neceſſarily give us a *new one*.

* p. 34.

I am very far from being an Enemy to *Claſſical Letters*; and look upon them, not onely *as ornamental*, but highly *uſeful*, and *even neceſſary to a Divine*; but ſtill I muſt affirm, that *this kind of Learning alone*, without *Skill* and *Experience in the Sacred and Apoſtolical Writings*, is ſo far from qualifying a Man for *an Editor of the New Teſtament*, that it will neceſſarily lead him into *Error* and *Miſtake*, and make him onely *corrupt the Text*, whilſt he pretends to be *mending it*.

---

[a] Quid facit cum Pſalterio Horatius? cum Evangeliis Maro? cum Apoſtolis Cicero? Hier. ad Euſtoch.

We cannot have a *ſurer Proof* and *Demonſtration* of what I am aſſerting, than from *our Editor himſelf*, who, *in his Controverſy with the honourable Mr.* Boyle, *about* Phalaris'*s Epiſtles*, had confidently aſſerted, that προδίδωμι *never ſignified* giving *before*, *but onely* betraying; *that* διώκω *never ſignified* ſimply following after, *but onely* purſuing *as a perſecutor*; that θυγατέρες *never ſignified* Maidens *or* Women *in general*, *but onely* Daughters; and tho' theſe Obſervations might perhaps be generally *true as to prophane Authors*, yet they were found to be *certainly falſe in the ſacred ones*, as appeared by many Inſtances brought from the *Goſpels* and *Epiſtles*; upon which the Learned and Ingenious Author makes [a] this *very juſt* Reflection, that *ſo profound a Græcian and Divine ſhould have looked a little into the New Teſtament, before he had pronounced ſuch raſh and groundleſs Aſſertions.*

Our Editor however, to make good his Argument, tells us,
* p. 36. * *that the World has ſeen enough what poor Work is made in this*
kind by meer Theologues without Claſſical Letters. A Theologue, we
ſee, is of all Creatures moſt contemptible to him; how does he
† p. 35. *wipe him* at every turn *with old Conſcience* †, *Caſuiſtical Drudge* *,
* p. 22. *Splitter of Caſes* †? *&c.* Nay, his Friends tell us plainly, that *theſe*
† p. 42. *Theologues* are ſo very ſilly as not to *ſubſcribe for his Edition*, and
ſo muſt needs make *poor Work on't* indeed by *preaching on* ſtill
out of the *old dull Text of* Stephens *or* Mill.

Yet what *Theologues are theſe*, I would fain know, who have made *ſuch wretched Work in their Editions of the Scriptures?* The World, I am ſure, has been as much obliged *to ſome of them* in this Way, as to any Men who have yet appeared in it; and owes the *nobleſt Editions of the Bible* now extant to *the Learning and Induſtry of meer Theologues.* This may be proved by ſuch an Authority, as he himſelf cannot diſpute, even his *own Words*; for in *his Remarks on Freethinking*, he ſays [*a*], *As Scaliger, Caſaubon, Heinſius,* &c. *when they deſigned to publiſh a correct Edition of an Author, firſt laboured to procure all the Manuſcripts they could hear of, as the onely Means that promiſed laudable Succeſs; ſo* Stephanus, Junius, Circellæus, Walton, Fell, *and* Mill *proceeded in the ſame Method. All theſe, except Stephens,* ſays he, *were Chriſtian Prieſts*, that is, *as profound, true Theologues* as ever were. But we ſee how deſirous he is to make up Matters with *theſe Freethinkers*, and for *the civil things* he once ſaid *of the Prieſts*, reſolves to make them Amends by *paying off the poor Theologues*.

---

[a] Vid. Diſſertation upon *Phalaris*'s Epiſt, examined by the Honourable Mr. *Boyle*, p. 68.

But he checks * me here very properly with having forgot that he had *preached eight Sermons about thirty Years ago at Mr.* Boyle's *Lectures*; and he might have added *two more* ſince that time, *one at Court, the other at the Univerſity*. How therefore could *his whole Life be ſpent in Critical Niceties?* The Reflection I own to be juſt, *the Sermons* were quite out of my Head; but ſince he has put me in mind of them, I muſt do him the Juſtice to confeſs, that they are *undeniable Proofs* of his *profound Skill* and *great Experience in Theological Learning*; and it is well for him he went *no farther*; for he might otherwiſe have been in danger of paſſing for *as meer a Theologue* as his *two Predeceſſors Barrow* and *Pearſon*. * p. 36.

And now he is very ſevere upon me for the *Choice of * my Motto in the Title-page of my Remarks:* For whilſt I thought to have given *a Hint by it*, how *our Critic was like to lay-about him, in mangling the ſacred Text, Peter Burman*, it ſeems, from *whoſe Oration* it was taken, was all the while *onely in Jeſt*; but what's that to the Purpoſe, except he could prove *me* to have been *in Jeſt too?* If a *Dutch Orator* will needs be talking *Senſe* the *wrong Way*, why may not I take the Liberty of *turning it to the Right?* The Senſe of *a Motto* is not, I preſume, to be looked for onely in the Author from whom it was borrowed, but in *the Application of the Borrower*. But *he thanks me kindly † for my mention of Peter Burman*, and takes the Opportunity of paying his Compliments * p. 36. † Ibid.

[*a*] Part 1. p. 74.

upon *this Oration of his, which,* he ſays, *is a very fine one in its Way, all writ in* Lucian's *Manner, a thorough Irony and Jeer.* And it is indeed as *thorough a Jeer* as ever yet appeared, and *as dull an one too*, upon *the Church, the Clergy*, and every thing *ſerious* and *ſacred in the Practice* and *Principles* of both; it is juſt, as he tells us, *to let his Audience know, that to make a profound Theologue there's no need of any Skill at all, either in Languages, or Hiſtory, or Eloquence, or Critic.*

* p. 37. We have *one feeble Fling more*, ſays he, * and *this Paragraph is done*; and yet *this feeble Fling*, which he makes ſo *light of*, is nothing leſs than a *glaring Contradiction* between *his Specimen* and *Propoſals. He declares that he will not alter one Letter in the Text, without Authorities ſubjoined in the Notes*; and yet I have ſhewn that he has *altered many Letters in the Greek, without ſubjoining any Authorities*; and made *a verbal Emendation in the third Verſe of the Latin, even contrary to all the Authorities he ever ſaw.* As
† Ibid. to *the firſt*, he ſays, † *that the Reaſon of Literal Emendations could not be made appear in this ſhort Specimen*; as if *his Specimen*, let it be *as ſhort* as he pleaſes, had not *as much Room* in Proportion, as as any other *Part*, or the *whole* of his *Edition.* But obſerve a little, how *acutely* he defends himſelf. He had undertaken *to ſubjoin* the Reaſon of *every literal Alteration*; but now he ſays, '*twas not to be done*; *the Reaſon of ſuch Alterations could not be made appear*, that is, I had charged him with a *Contradiction*, and he owns that he had *promiſed an Impoſſibility.* As to the *verbal Emendation*, tho' *he had*, he ſays, *no Manuſcript for it, yet he had ſuch cogent Reaſon as is equal to Authority.* But to ſhew him, that I have no Mind to quarrel with him merely *for Letters*, or *an Alteration or two of the Latin Text*, I will produce a *Greek Emendation* he has made, [*v.* 8.] *viz.* ἔϐλεψα *changed* by him into ἔϐλεπον, in all the *three Editions of his Propoſals*, without *the leaſt Syllable ſubjoined in the Notes*, either of *any Authorities*, or *any of his cogent Reaſons.* But there might not perhaps *be room enough* for this neither within the Compaſs of ſo *ſhort a Specimen*; and this indeed muſt be ſaid for him, that *no Editor* ever contrived to huſband *his little Room*

more dextrouſly; for *many of his Emendations* appear with no *longer Train* or *Attendance* after them, than that onely of a *ſingle Manuſcript.*

Paragraph the Sixth.

If the Author has any thing to ſuggeſt towards a Change of the Text, not ſupported by any Copies now extant; he will offer it ſeparate in his Prolegomena; *in which will be a large Account of the ſeveral MSS. here uſed, and of the other Matters which contribute to make this Edition uſeful. In this Work he is of no Sect or Party; his Deſign is to ſerve the whole Chriſtian Name. He draws no Conſequences in his Notes; makes no oblique Glances upon any diſputed Points, old or new. He conſecrates this Work as a* κειμήλιον, *a* κτῆμα ἐσαεὶ, *a* Charter, *a* Magna Charta, *to the whole Chriſtian Church, to laſt when all the Ancient MSS. here quoted may be loſt and extinguiſhed.*

REMARKS.

Our Editor is here very ſevere upon me for being ſo mute * * p. 37. where *ſo fair an Occaſion* was given me of diſplaying my Parts, and for taking no notice of *the plauſible Topics* he had thrown in my Way, *viz. Emendations* and *mere Conjectures, not ſupported by any Copies now extant; of no Sect or Party; no Regard to any diſputed Points. The Topics,* I own, are *good* and *fruitful*; but they did not at that time come at all within the *Scheme* or *Deſign of my Remarks.* He was here giving us an Account onely of what he *deſigned to do in his* Prolegomena, a Work, which we have not yet ſeen *any Specimen* of; and my Buſineſs was onely to diſpute *about Fact,* and to meddle no farther *with his Edition,* than as it was *exhibited* and *appeared in his Propoſals*; however, if we live to ſee his *Prolegomena publiſhed,* he will hardly have any Reaſon to complain of my *neglecting* him; for I ſhall be very ready to do him Juſtice on the Occaſion, and let *his Subſcribers* know what a Penny-worth they have got for their Money. But is it not ſtrange in the mean while, that he ſhould be ſo *ſmart* upon me in *one Part of* *this Parapraph*, of which I had not taken the leaſt Notice, and yet have nothing at all to ſay to me *in the other*, of which I had taken ſo much? Is not this like a *true Bully*, to vapour and ſwagger when the Coaſt was clear, yet ſneak preſently out of ſight as ſoon an Adverſary appeared? And yet I had ſaid enough here, one would think, to make it *ſcandalous* for him to be ſilent, either as a *Critic* or *a Chriſtian*; I had proved upon him a *manifeſt Blunder* and *Soleciſm* in the Uſe and Application he had made of a *Claſſical Greek Word*; I had ſhewn *his Inſolence* to be but *little ſhort of Blaſphemy*, in the Stile he aſſumed of *granting Charters to the Chriſtian Church*; all which he thinks ſufficiently anſwered by calling it *an aukward Ridicule upon* Κειμήλιον *and* Magna Charta.

We have had *Great* and *Learned Editors of the Bible* from all the principal Countries of *Europe*; but I defie e'er a *Gaſcon*, *Italian*, or *Spaniard of them all* to ſhew me ſuch a piece of *true, genuine Rhodomontade* as this *very Paragraph.*

Having already ſhewn us how *accurate* and *correct* he is in the *Uſe of his Greek and Latin*, he comes now to give us a *Specimen* of the great Propriety of *his Engliſh:* For in *this Paragraph*, having promiſed *Immortality to his Labours*, he tells us, *that his Edition is to laſt, when all the ancient MSS. are to be extinguiſhed.* This *Extinction of Manuſcripts* I have, it ſeems, cavilled at in *my Remarks*, as a *barbarous Phraſe*. But I cannot make *our Critic* apprehend, that I mean *any Soleciſm* or *Abſurdity in the Expreſſion*, but a *Cruelty* onely and *Barbarity* in *the Thought of extinguiſhing Manuſcripts*; it cannot enter into his Head, that *to extinguiſh*, is properly applicable onely *to Fire*, either *real* or *metaphorical*; either *the thing* it ſelf, or ſomething *analogous to it*; but he ſtill blunders along for a *whole Paragraph* together, to prove by many *Inſtances of Hiſtory*, that as *cruel* as the Thought is, it is however a *true one*; and that *Manuſcripts have really been extinguiſhed* in ſeveral Ages and Countries by *Jews*, *Turks*, *Infidels* and *Hereticks*. Some of his Inſtances are *pleaſantly ridiculous*; *the Library of Alexandria*, ſays he, * *conſiſted of nothing elſe but Manuſcripts?* and *were not the Manuſcripts extinguiſhed when the Library was burnt?*

* p. 38.

Again, whence have we our famous Manuſcript at Cambridge? *Was it not from a Monaſtery in* Lions? *And how could ours have been preſerved, when the Monaſtery was plundered, if its Manuſcripts had not been extinguiſhed?* From theſe Premiſſes he concludes, that *our Maſter's Thought is not ſo barbarous, as our Cenſor's Cavil is ignorant and ſilly.*

The Reader muſt needs think him ſtrangely *deſtitute of Friends*, that he had no body near to *adviſe him* on this Occaſion; to hinder his expoſing himſelf at this Rate. Where was *his Overſeer* and *Corrector Mr. John Walker?* Why could not he let him know, that the World would never endure *ſuch Trumpery?* Some body ſhould indeed be *ſo free*, as to tell him that he is *now grown old*; that *his Parts* and *Learning* are plainly *running upon the Dregs*; that 'tis time for him *to have done*, and think of *quitting the Stage*, before he be quite *hiſſed off*.

Paragraphs the Seventh and Eighth.

To publiſh this Work, according to its Uſe and Importance, a great Expence is requiſite: It's deſign'd to be Printed, not on the Paper or with the Letter of this Specimen, *but with the beſt Letter, Paper, and Ink that* Europe *affords. It muſt therefore be done by Subſcription or Contribution. As it will make Two Tomes in Folio, the Loweſt Subſcription for Smaller Paper muſt be Three Guineas, one advanc'd in preſent; and for the Great Paper Five Guineas, two advanc'd.*

The Work will be put to the Preſs, as ſoon as Money is contributed to ſupport the Charge of the Impreſſion; and no more Copies will be Printed than are ſubſcribed for. The Overſeer and Corrector of the Preſs will be the Learned Mr. JOHN WALKER *of* Trinity-*College in* Cambridge; *who with great Accurateneſs has collated many MSS. at* Paris *for the preſent Edition. And the Iſſue of it, whether Gain or Loſs, is equally to fall on Him and the Author.*

REMARKS.

From *theſe two Paragrvphs* I have obſerved, how this *great* and *glorious Deſign,* under Pretence *of doing Service to common Chriſtianity,* dwindled here at laſt into a *meer Money-Project,* contrived and purſued only for *Gain* and *filthy Lucre. Our Editor,* in his Anſwer, laughs onely at *my Simplicity,* for being *ſilly enough* to imagine, that there could *be any thing elſe* in it: *For without* † p. 38. *that indeed,* ſays he, † *what Senſe, what Uſe in Propoſals?* We would have had him publiſhed, I warrant ye, *ſome whining, canting Advertiſement, to beg the Advice onely* and *Aſſiſtance of the Learned*; to deſire *no other Contributions* than of *Manuſcripts* and *Materials,* proper for *ſo great* and *pious a Deſign,* No, no; he knows too well *the Senſe and Uſe of Propoſals*; and it cannot be denied but that *thoſe now before us* are the *moſt compleat* in their Kind, the *moſt effectual* for carrying on *the Learned* and *Laudable Trade of begging,* that ever before appeared. How *artfully does he barter and higgle* with us here, to *quicken the Market,* and gain *his Price* upon us? But of this I have already ſaid enough in my *former Remarks.*

However, ſince he has been ſo kind, as to let us into the Secret of the *true Uſe* and *Senſe of Propoſals, viz.* the *begging Subſcriptions,* I ſhall in return give him a *piece of Advice,* which he may probably find Reaſon to thank me for; that is, *to get his Propoſals read in Churches by way of Brief on Sundays.* This, I am confident, muſt be the ready Way of making *the beſt Penny* of them; he may eaſily try the Experiment in *his own Archdeaconry*; and in *making the Eſſay,* * *muſt needs reap glorious Fruits of his Sagacity and his Labour*; for *twenty Churches burnt* to the Ground can never draw *our Money* from us ſo freely, as the doing *ſo ſignal a piece of Service to the whole Chriſtian Name.* * p. 20.

SPECIMEN. See the Specimen in my former Remarks.

REMARKS.

We are now come to a *Review of his Specimen*; where *our Editor* makes himſelf *very merry* with what I have ſaid about his *borrowing all his Materials from Dr.* Mill: For he demonſtrates † † p. 40, &c.

by a *nice* and *curious Calculation*, that of *ſixty Emendations*, which he has made *in the Text*, *the Doctor agrees with him onely in four*; *diſſents from him in three*; *ſtarts one contemned by our Maſter*; *who has fifty-two yet remaining entire to himſelf*, his own proper Goods and Chattels.

> Vide quantùm timeam cachinnos tuos ut etiam nunc eadem ingeram. Hieron.

But he may *laugh* as much as he thinks fit, I ſhall however ſtick to *my Point*, and give him the Pleaſure of affirming *once more*, that *all his Materials* are *borrowed*, or *ſtolen*, or *plunder'd*, call it which he pleaſes, *from Dr. Mill's Magazine.*

The *Doctor's Deſign in his Edition*, was, as I have before obſerved, to ſubjoin to *Stephens's Text* all the *various Readings* now known, with their *diſtinct Authorities*. This *our Editor* calls a *Promptuary to the Judicious and Critical Reader*; and from this *Promptuary* has taken *every ſingle Reading*, without *one* Exception, of all *thoſe fifty-two* which he ſo confidently calls *his own*. And what is this, I would fain know, but *ſtealing from Dr. Mill?* Was ever *any Theft* more evident, or more fully proved than this? *The Goods* are found upon him; are known to be *Dr. Mill's*; and he himſelf has *owned the Fact*.

There's another of his *Remarkable Contradictions* very proper to be taken notice of here. He told us, we know, and took a great deal of Pains to prove it, that *Dr. Mill had put all his various Readings upon equal Credit to the great Offence of many good Perſons*; yet now he has been labouring *for a whole Page* together *, to prove *juſt the contrary*; that he was ſo far from *putting all his Readings upon equal Credit*, that in this *ſingle Chapter of the Specimen*, he had *diſtinguiſhed four of them as true*; *three others as falſe*; and *one as dubious*. * p. 41.

But our Editor informs † us here, *that his Deſign in this Edition, is no more than to give us an accurate or authentic Greek Text*, or as he explains it in another Place, * to reſtore the Text to *Truth*, † p. 40. * p. 32.

Certainty and *Order*; a Deſign truly *modeſt* and *worthy of himſelf.* He deſigns onely to *do that*, in relation *to the Greek*; which he had charged as a kind of Impiety upon the † *Papiſts*, for executing *onely in the Latin*, viz. *the authorizing and authenticating a particular Edition.* Out of the *Plenitude of his Power*, and by his *ſingle Authority* he declares his own *Greek Text Authentic*; yet will not allow to *two ſucceſſive Popes* [a] *aſſiſted by the moſt Learned Men of* Europe, and *backed by a Council, to declare the ſame of a poor Latin one.* Nay, he goes much farther than *the Church of Rome*; for *his Edition* muſt not onely be *authentic*, but *accurate too*; whereas the *Council of Trent* contented themſelves with making the *Vulgate Verſion authentic* to the People, but did not pretend to call it *accurate* or without Faults, but *quite the contrary.* † p. 26.

Rob. Stephens's *Edition of the New Teſtament* has been univerſally received and acquieſced in by all People, *Proteſtants* as well as *Papiſts*; tho' not as the *very Original Infallible Text*, yet as in the main a *very correct one*, or at leaſt not *groſly corrupt* and *imperfect.* Nay, *our Editor himſelf* has formerly given it the high Character of a *beautiful* and *generally ſpeaking accurate Edition, which*, as he ſays [b], *has ever ſince been counted a Standard, and followed by all the reſt.* Yet after all, he now pretends to have diſcovered in this *very Text of Stephens* * *above ſixty Faults, within the Compaſs of one and twenty Verſes.* If this Proportion be obſerved *through the whole*, what a *monſtrous Number* muſt *the Corruptions* amount to? They muſt make at leaſt, I dare ſay, twenty thouſand. And is not this *abſurd and incredible a priori*, as he calls it? Is it not a *direct Contradiction in Terms*, that *an Edition ſhould be generally accurate*, and yet ſo *ſcandalouſly faulty*? Muſt not the *Chriſtian World* have been *infatuated* and *himſelf* too, for admiring ſo long *an Edition as correct*, which appears at laſt, to be *more corrupt* and *interpolated*, than even the *very vileſt* of all *the recent*, † *ſcrub*, and *ſcoundril Manuſcripts* he talks of? * p. 42. † p. 33, 34.

---

[a] Vid. Serm. on Popery. [b] Rem. on Freethink. part 1. p. 68.

But we ſhall ſoon ſee a good Account of this Difficulty, and how eaſy it is to find *ſuch Faults* as he does, with *Stephens*, or any *other Editor* whatſoever, by examining *ſome* of his *principal Emendations*, that are to make *this Text* of his ſo *accurate* and *authentic*. I had taken notice of *one of them*, in *my Remarks*, as a *Taſte of his great Sagacity and Judgment*; but this he is pleaſed to call † a *nauſecus Taſte of my own Arrogance and Pedantry*. In the ſecond Verſe of *his Specimen* he has put ἐντεῦθεν ϗ ἐκεῖθεν] into the *Text*, inſtead of ἐντεῦθεν ϗ ἐντεῦθεν] which all *other Editors* but *himſelf* had preferred as the *genuine Reading*. Now *this Alteration of his* is ſo far from adding any *Accuracy* or *Correctneſs to the Text*, that I will maintain it to be a *downright Corruption* of it; a *meer Blunder of his own*, for want of his *Characters requiſite*; * *Judgment* and *Experience* in the *Stile* and *Writings of the Apoſtle*. I have obſerved, that *the Phraſe is a pure Hebraiſm*, and that the *Hebrews* have no *other Way* of expreſſing themſelves on the Occaſion, but by a *Repetition of the ſame Word*; of which I gave a few Inſtances. But here he tells us, † with his *uſual Wit* and *Smartneſs*, that my *three Hebrew Particles, when ſtript of their Garb, are no more, than Mizzeh umizzeh*; *Mippo umippo*; *Hennah vehennah*; and I ſhould have wondered indeed very much, if they had proved to be *any thing elſe*; it is juſt *as witty*, as to ſay, that *his boaſted Criticiſm*, when *ſtript of its Grecian Dreſs*, is *no more* at laſt, than *enteuthen kai ekeithen*. But let them look as *ſimple* and *naked* as he pleaſes; I am however content with finding them to be *juſt what I could wiſh them*; *juſt what I deſigned them*; and *juſt enough for my Purpoſe*.

† p. 42.

* p. 31.

† p. 42.

It being allowed then, that *the Hebrews* always expreſs *this Phraſe* in the *Old Teſtament*, by *repeating the ſame Word*; I obſerved next, that *the Septuagint* likewiſe in *their Tranſlation* follow the ſame Manner *in Greek*, rendring it by ἔνθα ϗ ἔνθα; ἐντεῦθεν ϗ ἐντεῦθεν. It is therefore highly probable, that St. *John*, who was a *Hebrew*, ſhould preſerve the *conſtant Idiom* of his *Native Language*, and when writing *Greek*, ſhould (*as all the other Apoſtles* generally do) copy after *the Stile of the Septuagint.* The *Critics* tell us [a] beſides, *that St.* John *of all the other Sacred Writers, abounds more particularly in Hebrew Phraſes*, and *that to underſtand the Senſe of his Writings, it is as neceſſary to know Hebrew as Greek it ſelf*; which gave me Occaſion to ſay, *that it is not poſſible to imagine, that he could uſe any other Phraſe in this Place, than the old Reading which our Critic has rejected.* But to make this Point ſtill plainer, I will prove it to him for once in *his own Way* of Reaſoning which he is every where *ſo fond of*; and ſhew him, that beſides theſe *Arguments a priori*, which are as ſtrong and convincing as the Nature of ſuch Proof will admit, we have *Fact* and *Demonſtration a poſteriori* to prove the Truth of what I am aſſerting: For in the *onely other Place of this Apoſtle's Writings*, where he has Occaſion to uſe *this Phraſe*, he uſes likewiſe *the very ſame Words* ἐντεῦθεν ϗ ἐντεῦθεν, *John* xix. 18.] without any *diſputed* or *various Reading* at all upon it. But this *our Editor* takes not the *leaſt notice of*, thinking it either of *too little Moment* to be anſwered by him, or of *too much*; the Reader may judge which.

And now let us conſider, what he has to ſay in *Defence of his Reading*. He firſt tells us, * *that the Senſe of either does not differ in a Tittle*, which is ſo far from being *an Excuſe* for him, that it is even *quite the contrary*: For what Occaſion had he then to *change a Paſſage*, which *all the Editors before him* had allowed *to be genuine*; and which is the *conſtant Phraſe* of the *ſacred Writers*; in order *to foiſt in a new Expreſſion* of his own, which is not ſo much as once to be found in *all the Scriptures*, either of the *Old* or *New Teſtament?* He tells us beſides, † *that St.* Jerom *in his Latin Verſion of the Hebrew, varied the Phraſe, and tranſlated* [mippo umippo] *ten times* [hinc & inde] *for once* [hinc & hinc]. And what does he get by this, but to prove onely that *this Father*, in his *Tranſlation*, did not in Fact *ſtick ſo cloſely to the very Words*, as he would make us believe; and that if we were to fol-

* p. 42.

† Ibid.

---

[a] Minùs quàm cæteri Evangeliſtæ Græcè locutus eſt; Hebraicis phraſibus abundat, ut Hebraici Sermonis peritia, non minùs quàm Græci, ad ſenſum ſententiarum aſſequendum ſit neceſſaria. Cardinal. Tolet. Argum. Comm. in Joan.

low *his Latin ſo ſcrupulouſly*, as he would perſuade us, it would, as I have ſaid, lead us onely *to corrupt*, inſtead of *correcting the Text?* But his main Excuſe is, that he was governed here *by Authority*, in the making *the Alteration*; that is, he found *eight Manuſcripts*, as he ſhews in *his Notes*, which declared *for it*; and yet he might find without doubt, if he pleaſes, *at leaſt twice the Number* declaring *againſt it*. But ſuppoſing ſtill, that *all the Copies* were agreed in his Favour, yet in the *third Verſe of the Latin*, we find him over-ruling the *united Teſtimony of all the Manuſcripts in the World*, for *Reaſons* which he calls as *convincing* * and *cogent as any Authority*; and yet he will not pretend that * p. 37.
thoſe Reaſons are *half ſo cogent*, as what I have produced in this very Inſtance directly *againſt him*. But *he has had an Opportunity*, he tells us, † *to hear one of the beſt Judges in* England *ſay, after he* † p. 40.
had carefully read over his Specimen, that of his ſixty Changes of the Text, there was not one but what ſhould be there, as every knowing Man would allow. And yet here I will ſtill *join iſſue* with him; and if he can produce *one Man* (*excepting two or three of Trinity-College*) that paſſes either for a *wiſe* or *learned one*, who will declare *this very Emendation* to be *juſt*, and *preferable to the old Reading*; nay, who will not own it to be *ſpurious and corrupt*; I promiſe not to ſay *one Word* more againſt *his Edition*, nay to be content *even to ſubſcribe for it* my ſelf.

In the 8th Verſe, we find in *Stephens*'s *Text*, καὶ ὅτε ἤκουσα καὶ ἔϐλεψα ἔπεσα ϖροσκυνῆσαι ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ϖοδῶν τοῦ ἀγγέλου] where, as I have already obſerved, he has changed [ἔϐλεψα into ἔϐλεπον] *contrary*, we ſee, to the Conſtruction of *the two other Verbs*, to which it is joined in the ſame Sentence, immediately before and after it, and yet without aſſigning *the leaſt Reaſon*, or producing ſo much *as a ſingle Authority* for it; but whilſt he is altering here *ſo arbitrarily*, it is ſtrange that he ſhould take no notice of the *very next Word* [ἔπεσα] *a Word*, ſo far from being one of his *polite* and *elegant ones*, that it can hardly be accounted *Greek*; and tho' we find it ſometimes in *the Scripture*, yet never, I believe, *without a various Lection*; and in this *very Place the Complutenſian Edition* and *ſome Manuſcripts* have inſtead of it ἔπεσον.

But the *chief Emendation* we find here is ſtill the *moſt unaccountable*; being evidently *falſe* and *ridiculous*, *viz.* ϖρὸ ϖοδῶν inſtead of ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ϖοδῶν] the *Hebrew Phraſe* on this Occaſion is, *before the Face of his Feet.* St. *John* ſometimes uſes the *very Hebraiſm*; as *Rev.* iii. 9. ϖροσκυνήσωσιν ἐνώπιον τῶν ϖοδῶν σȣ̃.] ſometimes *that*, which comes *the neareſt to it*; *the very Expreſſion, which our Editor here rejects*, as in *this ſame Book of Revelations*, xix. 10. ϗ ἔπεσον ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ϖοδῶν ἀυτȣ̃ ϖροσκυνήσαι] without *any difference of Reading*, obſerved upon it in *any Author* or *Manuſcript* whatſoever. But *our judicious Critic*, without any Regard to, or indeed any Notion of the *Apoſtolic Stile*, has thought fit to change the *Phraſe of the Text*, into [ϖρὸ ποδῶν] an Expreſſion *wholly unknown* to the *ſacred Penmen*; not *once* to be met with in the *New Teſtament*; and yet he has *no better Authority* for the *ſtrange Freedom* he is pleaſed to take, than *that of a ſingle Manuſcript*. But his *old* Argument, *ſcribe meo periculo*; which is of ſo much Uſe to him in *his Criticiſms on profane Authors*; muſt be underſtood likewiſe here, to ſupply the Defect of *his other cogent Reaſons.*

In the 5th Verſe, inſtead of the common Reading ϗ χρείαν ȣ̓κ ἔχȣσι λύχνȣ ϗ φωτὸς ἡλίȣ] he has given us, ϗ ȣ̓χ ἕξȣσιν χρείαν φωτὸς λύχνȣ ϗ φωτὸς ἡλίȣ] with what Juſtice I ſhall not at preſent examine; all that I would now obſerve upon it is, that for the Support of *this Alteration* he has *falſly alledged the Authority of the Coptic Verſion*; which I find to be *directly againſt him*, as appears by *the Tranſlation of it*, publiſhed by Dr. *Wilkins*, where *this Paſſage* runs thus; *neque opus habent lumine in illâ, neque lumine ſolis.*

In this Verſe likewiſe the *common Editions* have φοτίζει ἀυτȣ̀ς] *illuminat illos*; which our Editor has thought fit to change with no great Reaſon, into φωτίσει *illuminabit*] but this might perhaps have been allowed him, if it were not for *the other Part of his Emendation*, ſupported by *the ſlender Authority of a ſingle Manuſcript onely* and *a Modern Greek Auther*, viz. φωτίσει ἐπ᾽ ἀυτȣ̀ς, inſtead of ἀυτȣ̀ς] which is another *new Phraſe of his own*, never *once* made uſe of by *the ſacred Writers*, who conſtantly expreſs themſelves without *one Inſtance* that I can find to the contrary, in the *very*

Form and *Manner of Conſtruction*, which he here rejects; as St. *John* again particularly, in the *Chapter before the Specimen*, xxi. 23. ἐφώτισεν αὐτὴν] and in his Goſpel, i. 9. φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον] Surely there never was *a truer* κακοζηλία than this; a *more ſenſeleſs, abſurd Affectation of altering* contrary to *all Reaſon, Judgment* and *Authority*, as if *the Merit of an Edition* depended meerly on the *Number of the Alterations* it exhibited; but he had a Mind, I preſume, to demonſtrate *by Experiment* the Truth of *an Aſſertion* he had formerly made [a], *that if we were to put all the thirty thouſand Readings into the Hands of a Knave or a Fool, yet with the moſt ſiniſtrous and abſurd Choice he could not extinguiſh the Light of any one Chapter.*

In the 11th Verſe we read, ϗ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἔτι, ϗ ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω] where inſtead of [δικαιωθήτω] he has put [δικαιοσύνην ϖοιησάτω] into *the Text*, as the *Complutenſian Editors* had done before him. But tho' there is, I confeſs, the Shew of *great Authority* for *the Truth of this Emendation*, yet it ſeems ſtill very clear to me, that [δικαιωθήτω] is the *true*, *original Reading*; and that *the other* crept pretty early into *the Text* from *the Margin*, where it had been placed *by way of Paraphraſe* or *Explication*; which Dr. *Mill* has intimated likewiſe in *his Notes* as *his Opinion*. It is to *ſuch Marginal Notes*, as I have before obſerved, that we owe *moſt of the Interpolations of the ſacred Text*: And 'tis likewiſe hardly credible that *a Phraſe* of *ſo difficult* and *obſcure Meaning* as [δικαιωθήτω] could ever *juſtle out of its Place*, *one* that was *clear* and *obvious*, and which no *Tranſcriber could boggle at*; but the contrary is very probable, and very common, *in all ſuch Caſes*, throughout *the Scriptures*. The *Latin Tranſlator*, whoſe Buſineſs was to regard *the Senſe*, would naturally give us what he found *in the Margin*, or what occurred perhaps to himſelf as the *onely Meaning of the Paſſage*; and ſo might prove afterwards *the main Authority* for taking into *the Text*, what at firſt was but *a Paraphraſe* upon it. But what *above all confirms me* in this Opinion,

---

[a] Vid. Rem. on Freethink. part 1. p. 76.

nion, is the *very Authority of St. Cyprian,* which *our Editor* hath produced to *confirm the contrary.* He tells us, that *St. Cyprian interprets this Paſſage* by [*juſtus juſtiora faciat adhuc*] But he either does not know, or is pleaſed to conceal, how *the laſt Part* of the Sentence is likewiſe *rendred* by him, *viz.* [*ſimiliter & qui ſanctus eſt ſanctiora*] which makes it *evident* and *certain* that *both the Branches* of this Sentence ſtood in the *ſame Form* and *Conſtruction* with each other in St *Cyprian*'s Copy ; and that [ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω] was read as *undoubtedly by him,* as [ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω] which laſt no body diſputes.

But what is *moſt remarkable* in this Place, is to find him *once more falſly producing the Authority of the Coptic Verſion,* in Confirmation of *this Reading* ; when it is in Fact *directly contrary* to it ; agreeing altogether with *that of Stephens,* as tranſlated by the *Gentleman* above-mentioned, *viz.* [*juſtus juſtificet ſe, ſanctus ſanctificet ſe*] thus like an *experienced Officer,* by a *falſe Muſter-roll* of Authorities, he gains *the Pay* and *Credit* of Forces, he cannot produce ; but he was confident here, again, I warrant ye, that *by keeping his own Counſel,* he ſhould have rendred all Diſcovery impracticable, yet the Obſervation was made and communicated to his Friends, (as I was accidentally informed) by a *Learned Foreigner* reſiding at *Oxford,* who was without doubt not a *little ſurprized* to catch *an Editor of the New Teſtament* (if we could believe it to have been wilful or deſigned] in ſuch a Fact and Inſtance of ſo plain a Falſification. 'Tis ſuch a *ſcandalous Impoſition* upon the World, as every *ingenuous Perſon* muſt needs abhor ; if other Writers were to allow themſelves ſuch Liberties, what *Faith,* what *Credit* could there be among *Men of Letters?* But if any one will chuſe rather to look upon it as a *pure Miſtake,* and (what our Editor will hardly thank him for) to have been done *ignorantly* ; 'tis however ſuch a *groſs Inſtance of Negligence,* as could not be excuſed in the *Edition of a profane Author* ; much leſs in a Deſign *ſo important* as this, where *the Blunder* muſt be perpetrated to *lateſt Poſterity,* in *a Work* already *conſecrated by its Author, as a Charter,* and *Magna Charta to the whole Chriſtian Church.*

When our Editor ſhall find himſelf able to anſwer theſe *further Remarks* upon *his Specimen and Propoſals*, I ſhall endeavour to exerciſe him ſtill, with a *few more* of the ſame Kind. In the mean while, the Reader cannot help ſeeing through *the ſhallow Artifice* of his taking the *laſt Chapter of the Revelations*, for *the Specimen of his Edition*; to perſuade us, that *the whole Work* is already done, and nothing wanting but the Encouragement of *Contributions* for the *ſending of it to the Preſs*. This, he imagined, would make the World *crowd in* upon him with *their Subſcriptions*, to ſecure to themſelves as early as poſſible *a Treaſure ſo valuable*. Yet it is more than probable, that this is *the onely Chapter of the Book*, which he has ſo much as attempted: For we may gather from an *unwary Confeſſion* he made, when * *excuſing the Blunders of his Specimen*; that he has not yet wrote out *the firſt foul Draught of his Deſign*. But as he learnedly expreſſes himſelf, † *Res ipſa loquetur*, *the Work will ſhew it ſelf*: For if he had got thro' the *reſt of the New Teſtament*, or had but *read it over*, with common Care and Obſervation, he could not have acquitted himſelf *here ſo blunderingly*; or if he had examined *onely the very Writings of St. John*, he could not poſſibly have miſtaken ἐντεῦθεν ϗ ἐκεῖθεν: φωτίσει ἐπ' αὐτοὺς: προσκυνήσας ϖρὸ ϖοδῶν: For *the Stile of the Apoſtle*.

* p. 19.
† p. 14.

And now, after all the Pains and Labour *of this mighty Critic*, he is like to leave the *ſacred Text* juſt as *diſputable* and *uncertain* as he found it; and it will ſtill be as eaſy for other People to make free with and expoſe *his Readings*, as it was *for him* to find fault with *Stephens*'s; whilſt all the Service that *the Chriſtian World* can expect from this *celebrated Performance*, is to have the *Text of Scripture* made *ſtrange, aukward, and new to us*, by a *Number of Alterations*; *many* of which will be found at laſt *to be falſe*; *more queſtionable*; and *all (by his own Confeſſion) inſignificant*.

Our Editor concludes his Book with a very *ſubtle Dilemma*, or one of *his cleft-ſtick* * *Arguments*, that catches a Man on *both ſides*. If *they will needs*, ſays he, *attack an Edition before it's begun, let them put their Names to their Work*; *if they do not, they ſhall have*

* p. 31.

no Anſwer; *and if they do, they will need none.* I have already had *the Honour of an Anſwer* from him even *without my Name*; but *the Diſcovery of it*, I find, is like to alter the *Caſe*, and make me forfeit at once *all Merit* and *Pretence* to the ſame Favour again. Being conſcious however of *no Offence* that *my Name* has ever given; nor of *any Infamy* upon it, to make it *odious* to any Man but *himſelf*, I am not at all aſhamed of producing it. And ſince it is, as he ſays, † *to die with me*, and *be buried ſhortly in Oblivion*; he muſt excuſe me the reaſonable Ambition of making the moſt I can of it *whilſt I live*; and that I may have *ſome Chance* for being known likewiſe *to Poſterity*; I am reſolved to faſten my ſelf *upon him*, and *ſtick as cloſe to him* as I can, in hopes of being dragged at leaſt by *his great Name* out of my *preſent Obſcurity*, and of finding ſome Place, though an humble one, in the *future Annals* of his Story.

† p. 9.

And being willing, before we part, to give him all the Encouragement I can towards *anſwering me*, I here promiſe, that let him be as *ſevere* or *ſcurrilous* as he pleaſes upon *my Perſon*, *Morals* or *Learning*, I will not make my ſelf *ſo mean*, as to *take the Law* of him, or *proſecute*, *Printer*, *Publiſher*, or *Author*; I ſhall be content to vindicate my Character with *the proper Weapons of a Scholar*, and do *my ſelf Juſtice* as well as I can; being ambitious of *no greater* Reputation in the World, than what I ſhall find *my ſelf* always very well able to defend.

A TABLE *of ſome of our Editor's apparent Contradictions and falſe Aſſertions obſerved in the foregoing* REMARKS.

In the firſt Paragraph of his Propoſals. THE Printed Copies of the New Teſtament, both of the Original Greek and Vulgar Latin are taken from Manuſcripts of no great Antiquity—recent and interpolated.	*Caſtigatiſſima omni ex parte vetuſtiſſimaque Exemplaria pro Archetypis haberemus, quorum tàm Græcorum quàm Latinorum multiplicem copiam,* &c. Præf. Bibl. Complut. *Tantæ prætereà vetuſtatis ut fidem eis abrogare nefas videatur.* Prol. ibid. *Adhibitis in conſilium utriuſque linguæ codicibus, nec iis ſanè quibuſlibet, ſed vetuſtiſſimis ſimul & emendatiſſimis.* Eraſm. ad Leo X. *Codices ipsâ vetuſtatis ſpecie pæne adorandos.* Rob. Steph. Our Editor in his Letter to Dr. *Mill* ſays, *Infinitam vim codicum MSS. curioſè excuſſiſti.* And ſpeaking of ſome onely of his MSS. *Atque hæc quidem talia Exemplaria, cum aliis omnibus ubivis gentium, quod ſciamus longè longèque & dignitate & tempore antecedant neque quidquam hodiè ſuperſit ſimile aut ſecundum.*
In his Third Paragraph. A Labyrinth of thirty thouſand various Readings, which crowd the Pages of our preſent beſt Editions, all put upon equal Credit, to the Offence of many good Perſons.	*In his Remarks on the Free-thinkers.* Dr. *Mill*, if we are to believe not onely this wiſe Author, but a wiſer Doctor, has been labouring to make the Text of Scripture precarious, by ſcraping together ſuch an immenſe Number of various Readings, as amount to above thirty thouſand. *Part* 1. *p.* 1. Had

	Several Prieſts of greater Zeal than Knowledge have oft by falſe Alarms frighted others. *Ibid.*
Had the learned Dr. *Whitby*, and the greater Part of the Clergy, which from his Alarm took that Offence, no common Senſe at that Time? *p.* 32.	What is it your *Whitbyus* ſo inveighs and exclaims againſt? *Ib.* In his Invective againſt my dead Friend he was ſuddenly ſeized with a Pannic, and under his Concern for the Text did not at all reflect what the Word really means. *p.* 68.
Paragraph the Third. All the various Readings put upon equal Credit to the Offence of many good Perſons.	*Page* 41, 42. Speaking of the ſingle Chapter of his Specimen, he proves; that Dr. *Mill* has actually diſtinguiſhed four Readings as true; three others as falſe; and one as dubious; all which relate to no Point of Controverſy whatſoever.
That the Readings in Dr. *Mill*'s Edition, which accompany the Text, are put upon equal Credit, without Rejection or Preference, (except in ſome Places that make the preſent Points of Controverſy) is certain and notorious.	And he may find, if he pleaſes, many more diſtinguiſhed by him in the very Notes, which accompany the Text of this Chapter, *v.* 5, 6, 11, 14, 18.
Paragraph the Third. The Author believes, that he has retrieved (except in very few Places) the true Exemplar of *Origen.*	*In his Specimen.* He has produced but three Readings from *Origen*, and rejects them all as falſe.
Paragraph the Fourth. The Author gives in his Notes all the various Readings now known, within the five firſt Centuries, and what has crept into the Copies ſince, is of no Value or Authority.	*In his Specimen.* He has omitted ſeveral Authorities of the five firſt Centuries, which Dr. *Mill* has given, as *Hilarius*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, v. 2, 5, 14. beſides ſome of the old Verſions. He has cited *Arethas* about thirty times, who lived near the middle of the ſixth Century; *Greg. Palamas* who lived in the 14th; the Complutenſian Edition very often, and even *Eraſmus*.

Para-

Paragraph the Fifth. The Author is very ſenſible, that in the ſacred Writings there's no Place for Conjectures; and he does not alter one Letter in the Text without Authorities ſubjoined in the Notes; and places under each Column the ſmalleſt Variation from the Greek of *Stephanus* and Latin of the two Popes.	*In his Specimen.* He has in the ſecond Verſe and elſewhere made ſome literal Alterations, without any account of them at all in his Notes: in the third Verſe of the Latin he has made an Emendation contrary to all the MSS. he ever ſaw; and in the fifth Verſe has made another verbal one in the Greek, without the leaſt Reaſon or Authority whatſoever ſubjoined or produced for it.
Page 43. Neither Dr. *Mill* nor any of the other Editors take any Notice in their Collation of Manuſcripts of the Order of the Words.	Mill. Prolegom. p. 132. *Exemplar ipſum quod attinet, deſcriptum eſt literis—in quibus ſedulò à ſcriptore cautum eſt, ut Græca & Latina ſibi invicem reſponderent, verbum ferè verbo, ſervato plerumque eodem ipſo verborum ordine.*
Page 42. *Arethas* lived about the fourth or fifth Century.	M. *Du Pin*, Dr. *Cave*, Dr. *Mill*, and all who place him the earlieſt, ſay, that he lived near the middle of the ſixth, others ſay, not till the tenth Century.
Page 14. Dr. *Mill* never once dreamt of the excellent Uſe of the Latin Vulgate, or ever collated one.	Mill. Prolegom. p. 142. *Veterem Novi Teſtamenti Italicam ſummâ veneratione proſequimur, ejuſque vel ſemeſa fragmenta auro contra non cara ducimus. Reſtat jam ipſius Hieronymi inſpiciamus Exemplar.* ib. p. 81.
Page 18. Of all which, Dr. *Mill*, with his incredible Diligence, knew no more than our Cenſor.	In his printed Letter to Dr. *Mill.* *Tu verò, Milli doctiſſime, qui omnium mortalium maximè in eo ſtudio verſatus es.*
Dr. *Mill* took all that heap of vicious Copies for one, and ſuperſtitiouſly and ignorantly made it his Idol, p. 26.	*Niſi vererer coràm in os Te laudare, dicerem quàm longo intervallo aliorum omnium in eo genere laboris poſt te reliqueris.*

A Piece of the moſt unfortunate and erroneous Critick that ever ſaw the Light, *p.* 26.

The moſt recent, the moſt vile, the moſt contemptible of all MSS. have ſome Share in the Honour of his genuine Readings, *p.* 33.

Quis ſanus would argue at this rate?

He follows ſuch ſcrub MSS. and ſuch ſcoundril Copies, as our Maſter would ſcorn to look into, *p.* 33, 34.

Omiſſions, the Doctor's peculiar Foible, *p.* 41.

Amicus Millius, ſed magis amica veritas, p. 26.

Page 27.

Four or five extant Copies of the Greek are older than any Latin one; but for Copies (of the New Teſtament) of a thouſand Years of Age, there are twenty Latin ones preſerved for one Greek.

Page 20.

St. *Jerom* tranſlated into Latin a complaining Letter from *Epiphanius* to *Chryſoſtom*, and was charged with warping the Words to *Chryſoſtom*'s Prejudice.

Te unum in hoc curriculum vocamus.

Omnia S. Patrum ſcripta, omnes antiquas verſiones, & infinitam vim codicum MSS. curioſè excuſſiſti.

As *Scaliger*, *Caſaubon*, *Heinſius*, &c. when they deſigned to publiſh a correct Edition of an Author, firſt laboured to procure all the MSS. they could hear of, as the onely Means that promiſed laudable Succeſs, ſo Dr. *Mill* proceeded in the ſame Method. *Free-th.* p. 74.

Dr. *Mill* an accurate Examiner of MSS. p. 68.

The Learned Dr. *Mill*, (whoſe Friendſhip and Memory will ever be dear to me) meets with a ſorry Recompence for his long Labour of 30 Years. *Free-th. p.* 1. *p.* 61.

Jac. le Long, a learned and moſt curious Enquirer after all the MSS. of the Bible, in his Catalogue of 100 of the beſt and oldeſt Latin MSS. now known in the World, tells us of none older than *Theodulphus*'s A.D. 790. mentions another of the Year 795. and a third, of which he doubts, reputed to be 1000 Years old. *Vid. le Long Bibl. ſacr. Par.* 1709. *it. M. Martin*'s *Defence of his Diſſert. in Engl.* p. 14.

This Letter of *Epiphanius*, tranſlated by *Jerom*, was not wrote to *Chryſoſtom*, but to *John* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, to admoniſh him to quit the Errors of *Origen*. *V. Hier.*

DE

LATINARUM LITERARUM

PRONUNCIATIONE

DISSERTATIO.

De Latinarum Literarum Pronunciatione Diſſertatio.

COnſideranti mihi ſæpenumero diverſam illam, quæ apud diverſas gentes obtinet, latinæ linguæ pronuntiandæ rationem, opus ille, non tam ſibi jucundum, quam ſtudioſis utile ſuſcepturus videretur, qui verum priſcumque latinarum vocum ſonum exquirere & revocare conabitur.

Quis enim non videt propter hanc, quæ in hiſce præſertim Regionibus invaluerit, pronuntiandi varietatem & licentiam, viros doctos latine inter ſe colloquentes vix ſeſe mutuò intelligere, nec ſinè labore quodam & moleſtia, verborum quam maximè familiarium ſenſus percipere poſſe.

Ipſe quidem cum apud exteras gentes verſarer, parum certè ſeu nihil potius commodi ex ſermonis latini uſu hauriendum animadverti; & ni linguarum etiam hodierno uſu florentium ſubſidium mihi aliquod comparâſſem, caruiſſem maximo illo quidem & jucundiſſimo itinerum meorum fructu,quem ex hominum literatorum colloquiis & conſuetudine familiari percepi.

Senſi enim viros, alioqui eruditos politoſque, ob hoc ipſum latinæ locutionis incommodum peregrinantium ſæpe congreſſus fugere; ni Gallicâ eos Italicâve linguâ uti poſſe intelligerent: cum enim linguam quiſque latinam eodem plane modo ac patrium ſermonem enuntiat, ſequitur ſanè, ut ne latine quidem loquentis verba ſenſuſque intelligere queamus, ni linguam ſimul ejuſdem vernaculam & gentilitiam teneamus.

Eraſmus ſe adfuiſſe olim commemorat cum die quodam ſolenni complures Principum Legati ad Maximilianum Imperatorem ſalutandi cauſa adveniſſent, ſinguloſque, Gallum, Germanum, Danum, Scotum *&c.* orationem latinam ita barbarè ac vaſte pronuntiaſſe, ut Italis quibuſdam, nil niſi riſum moverent, qui eos non latinè, ſed ſua quemque lingua, locutos juraſſent.

Sin autem verus unquam nativuſque literarum priſcarum ſonus revocari ac reſtitui, certaque aliqua pronuntiandi regula conſtitui omnibus poſſet; non hiſce modo malis remedium nobis paratum eſſet, linguaſque alias perdiſcendi labor viris doctis minueretur, ſed lingua ipſa latina ad cæteras etiam omnes rectè & grammaticè pronuntiandas tanquam exemplar & norma quædam proponeretur.

Sed contra omnino, & præpoſterè ſanè hac in re fieri videmus, tantum enim abeſt ut ad linguæ latinæ normam regulamque, cæteræ, quæ nunc in uſu ſunt, reducantur omnes & corrigantur, ut cæterarum potius omnium vitia, ſonoſque barbaros in eam jam transferri cernamus.

Ex omnibus autem, apud quos latini ſermonis uſus adhuc aliquis reſtat, prima emendatæ locutionis laus Italis certè debetur: Itali vero proximam Anglis deferunt: rectè ſecuſne alii judicent; quoniam ipſe pro patriæ caritate judex fortaſſe minùs æquus exiſtimarer: de Italis ratio certe ipſa evincit, homines illos, quorum in ſermone non vocum latinarum veſtigia ſolum, ſed voces ipſæ, & vera quaſi latinitas eluceant, unà cum vocibus a majoribus acceptis ſonos etiam antiquos quam maxime retinuiſſe: idque cunctorum certè experientia confirmabit, oſtendetque illud omne quod Italicæ pronuntiationis proprium, atque a reliquis linguis diverſum videtur, non niſi a Romanorum veterum uſu ac ſermone eſſe derivatum; uti pluribus infra exemplis perſpicuum fiet.

Elaborarunt olim hac in cauſa viri ſane magni Eraſmus, Lipſius, atque e noſtris Chekus, Smithuſque; quorum hi ad Græcæ potiſſimum linguæ, illi ad latinæ ſeſe pronunciationem non ſine magna doctrinæ ingeniique laude applicaverunt: omnium autem maxime Eraſmus; qui proprio marte, nulloque præeunte, rem obſcuram ac reconditam princeps explicare aggreſſus eſt, atque in hac diſputatione, ut in aliis omnibus, ſæculi ſui tenebras barbariemque debellare, priſcamque literarum & artium elegantiam revocare conatus eſt: Lipſius autem vix aliud mea quidem ſententia feciſſe videtur, ac Eraſmi libellum, abſque ulla ejus mentione, compilâſſe. Ab illis vero ſcriptoribus etſi plurima ingenioſe atque erudite diſputata ſint, nonnulla tamen deeſſe, multa dubiè, quædam etiam falſo poſita animadverti; idque hac in cauſa accidiſſe, quod in cæteris pleriſque ſolet, ut mortalium nemini detur rem inveniſſe ſimul & perfeciſſe.

Quippe multa jam nobis ſuppetunt argumenti hujus explicandi ſubſidia, quibus illi carebant; eruta ſcilicet poſt illa tempora antiquitatis omnis monumenta; & magnæ illæ inſcriptionum veterum moles, quæ collectæ ſimul, libriſque pervulgatæ in publicum jam omnibus proponuntur: e quibus melius longe, opinor, quam ex ipſis grammaticis, priſca latinarum vocum pronunciatio erui ac elici poteſt: literarum enim inter ſe permutationes, quas in inſcriptionibus perſæpe videmus, promiſcuuſque nonnullarum uſus, maxime vero ſculptorum in Orthographiæ leges peccantium errores germanam earum vim ſonumque indicare plane videntur.

Romanis enim idem certe contigiſſe cognovimus, quod nobis fere quotidie contingit; Marmorarios ſcilicet iſtos, quibus lapidum inſcribendorum cura commiſſa fuerit, Orthographiæ regulas ignorantes, errores idcirco fœdos in verbis ſæpe deſcribendis admiſiſſe, quos etſi verba minus recte, at verum verborum ſonum, alienis licet literis, ſecutos eſſe ac dediſſe conſtat: exempli gratia; ſiquis ſonum literæ X, a Græcis acceptæ, inveſtigare voluerit, in inſcriptionibus eam antiquis nonnunquam per c & s expreſſam & permutatam videbit, ut in vicſit; lucſerunt. [.] quibus in verbis etſi litera ipſa non appareat, vis tamen ejus plene expreſſa reperietur: atque eodem modo in cæteris ex literarum, quarum vis cognita eſt, permutatione illarum, de quibus dubitamus, nativum ſonum elicere valebimus.

Itaque dum Grammatici veteres literarum ſingularum ſonos, quod certe difficile eſt, verbis deſcribere atque exprimere laborant; marmora intereà vetera ſonum ipſum fictum quaſi ac formatum ante oculos ponunt. Hac igitur via inſiſtendum, atque inſcriptionum veterum ope literarum ſonos exquirendos mihi atque indicandos propoſui. In ſingulis vero deſcribendis, eas omnes prætermittere viſum eſt, quæ nihil in ſe ſingulare vel notatu dignum contineant, & in eis ſolum illuſtrandis conſiſtere, quæ in ſonos alienos delapſæ, atque a veterum uſu detortæ videntur.

Primùm igitur de vocalium pronunciatione, ex qua ſyllabarum vis omnis, ſonuſque pendent, quid ſtatuendum ſit videamus.

Ore contracto, magis quam par eſt, efferimus, quam tamen A.

rictu patulo proferendam Grammatici veteres docent: [*a*] idque de Græcorum etiam A confirmat *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus* [*b*] *qui ex vocalibus longis eam ſonantiſſimam eſſe ſcribit, proferrique ore quam maxime dilatato, ſpiritque cœlum verſus ſublato.* Atque hoc modo Itali eam Gallique hodie efferunt; Romanoſque etiam idem olim feciſſe conſtat; nam in marmoribus antiquis ad A interdum V vocalem contra Orthographiæ leges adjunctam, ut AVROMATARIVS. (Grut. 636. 7] ARCHILAVOS. [ib. 582. 6.] & pro A longâ duplicem perſæpe poſitam videmus, ut PAASTORES [150. 7] FAATO [1046. 6] *&c.* quæ omnia non niſi ſoni dilatationem quandam ſignificare videntur. FAATO NAATAM. Fabrett. 421.

E. Vocalis ſonum diſtincte & accurate explicare difficilius videtur: Italos ego, uti noſtros etiam, recte eam proferre cenſeo in vocibus, aſcendo, ventus *&c.* Gallos vero peſſime, qui iiſdem in locis eam ad ſonum A dilatare ſolent.

I. Sonum habuit medium quendam & communem cum ſuperiori E. Hoc Grammatici tradunt; confirmatque Quinctilianus, [*e*] qui T. Livium Sibe & Quaſe pro Sibi & Quaſi uti ſolere dicit. Neque ullarum toties in inſcriptionibus antiquis, quoties harum inter ſe vocalium permutatio reperitur, ut TETVLVS SACREFICIVM BENIVOLENTIA CAMINA [*f*] atque hinc mihi veriſimile videtur Romanos veteres eundem huic vocali ſonum attribuiſſe atque Itali hodie, nec alium ac nos per duplicem E exprimimus in Street, See. *&c.* quod ex hiſce præſertim vocibus apparet. DIANA. SPOLIA. EXEAT. CAVEAS. quas ita ſæpe ſcriptas reperio. DEANA. SPOLEA. EXSIAT. CAVIAS. [*g*] in quibus eum fere ſonum quem dixi expreſſum videmus.

Latini veteres I longam per EI Græcorum diphthongum ſcribebant: quem ſcribendi morem a Grammaticis memoratum plurimæ nobis adhuc inſcriptiones conſervant, ut CEIVIS. EITVR. IPSEIVS. QUEI. [*h*] neque aliter Græci in Romanis nominibus, ut ANTωNЄINOC. ΦΑϒCTЄINA. [*c*] Utrumque enim idem planè ſonuiſſe ex epiſtola quadam Ciceronis ad Pætum [*d*] colligere poſſumus; in qua de verbis, quæ obſcœna habebantur, ludens, cum loquimur, inquit, terni, nihil flagitii dicimus, at cum bini, obſcœnum eſt; alludens ſcilicet ad Græcam vocem *βινεῖ*, ut Græci vero I longam per ЄI. ita latini ЄI Græcorum quandoque per E productam, quandoque per I ſcribebant, ut Νεῖλος Nilus. Επικȣρεῖος Epicureus, qua in voce I tamen pro E poſita interdum legitur. Epicurius. [*e*] quod ſonum utriſque perſimilem fuiſſe demonſtrat. ARIA. Fab. 153.

[*a*] Marius Victorinus de enuntiatione iterarum. [*b*]

[*c*] Gruter. 636. 7. 582. 6.

[*d*] Ib. 150. 7: 1046. 6.

[*e*] l. 1. c. 7.

[*f*] Vid. Gruter. 1061. 6. 328. 1. 443. 6. 47. 10.

[*g*] Vid. ib. 39. 4, 7. Cenotaph. Piſan. 755. 1. 629. l. ult.

[*h*] Gruter. 206. 1. 171. 8. 541. 7.

Lipſius dicit ſolos Europæorum Britannos hanc vocalem recte proferre, [*f*] at omnium potius meo judicio peſſimè, atque a veterum more remotiſſime, uti ex pronunciatione vocum noſtrarum Mind. Bind. &c. cum ſuperioribus collata apparebit.

Nec minus quidem barbarè noſtri literam I, cum conſonantis loco ponitur, efferunt; qui pro ea ſemper G pronunciant, ut mageſtas. gecit. quam pronunciandi rationem Romanis penitus ignotam fuiſſe exiſtimo, qui eam ita in Majorca, Iuno, Iecit efferebant, uti nos Y conſonantem in York, You, Yes. I, inquit *Priſcianus* [*g*] *modo pro ſimplici, modo pro duplici accipitur conſonante; pro ſimplici, quando in principio dictionis ab ea incipit ſyllaba ſubſequente vocali ut Iuno: pro duplici, quando in medio dictionis ab ea incipit ſyllaba poſt vocalem, ut Majus, Pejus, ubi antiqui ſolebant geminare I & ſcribere Maiius, Peiius: quod non aliter pronunciari poſſet, quam ſi cum priori ſyllaba prior I, cum poſteriori altera proferetur Pei-ius. atque ita Pompei-ius; cujus genitivus per tria I ſcribebatur.* Quæ Priſciani verba ſonum illum mollem dulcemque I conſonantis, quem modo indicavi, deſignare planè videtur, nempe eundem prorſus quo Itali hodie eaſdem voces efferunt.

V. Eundem olim ſonum habuiſſe apud veteres Romanos atque hodie apud Italos, Græcæ ſcilicet diphthongi *ου*, certiſſimum eſt. Quippe ita eam in marmoribus antiquis perſæpe ſcriptam & expreſſam videmus, ut LOVGET. IOVSIT. INDOVCEBAMVS. OB

[*c*] Inſcript, Florent. 375.

[*d*] Epiſt. l. 9. 22.

[*e*] Aldi Orthograph. p. 20.

[*f*] De rec. pronunciat. lin. lat. c. 8.

[*g*] L. 1. c. de literar. numero.

INIOVRIAS IOVDICATI. [a] idque Grammatici etiam omnes confirmant [b]. nec Græci eam aliter in Romanis nominibus, ac per *ου* ſcribunt, ut ΙΟΥΛΙΟϹ. ΛΟΥΚΙΟϹ. &c. [c] atque hinc apud Suidam Κȣριωσσος Curioſus.

At de V conſonantis ſono haud inter doctos conſtare video: Eraſmus Lipſiuſque [d] eam per noſtram W proferendam cenſent, ut Winum, Wultus. idque variis argumentis probare conantur; nec aliam omnino vim Æolico Digamma attribuunt, cui hanc literam ſucceſſiſſe Grammatici tradunt. At Priſcianus contra [e] *Æolicum Digamma eandem vim ac Græcorum Φ, ſeu Latinarum PH, vel F habuiſſe* confirmat; *poſtea vero placuiſſe Latinis ejus loco V conſonantem adhibere, qui cognatione ſoni videbatur affinis eſſe.* Quibus verbis hanc conſonantem non alium apud veteres, atque apud nos hodie, ſonum obtinuiſſe oſtenditur.

Miratur autem Eraſmus literas haſce F & V conſonantem ob tantam ſoni affinitatem nuſquam inter ſe commutas reperiri: at Jo. Tertullium memoraſſe ſcribit, [f] ſe inſcriptionem veterem Romæ vidiſſe, in qua FIXIT. pro VIXIT. bis poſitam legiſſet. Atque in multis aliis inter Romana nomina animadverti. FICTORIA. FICTORIANVS. FICARIVS. FARVS. [g] quæ ab eodem fonte profluxiſſe videntur.

At hanc literam cum B plerumque permutatam cernimus. Ut BIXIT. VIBVS, OCTABIANVS. OVVIOLARIT. [h] Iſta vero cum litera B affinitus a ſono noſtræ W. quam maximè aliena videtur. Neque illud omnino veriſimile eſt, ejuſmodi ſonum Romanis unquam familiarem fuiſſe, cujus nullum prorſus apud Italos, ſed apud gentes ſolummodo remotas & barbaras, veſtigium remanſerit. CVVICVLO. IVVEO. Fabrett. Inſcrip. Ant. p. 102. VNIBERSIS. ib. VICTORIAE CONIVGI. 630. FICTORIA. 240. BICTORIA. 274.

Hæc vero, quæ de vocalium pronuntiatione diſputata ſunt, de ſono earum generali ac communi dicta intelligantur: quippe apud veteres, uti apud nos hodie, eaſdem vocales, non eandem ſemper vim in cúnctis æquè locis obtinuiſſe liquet; neque in ſyllabis breviter celeriterque enuntiandis ſonus cujuſque proprius diſtincte & accurate proferri ac exprimi poterat: atque hinc fit, ut in inſcriptionibus antiquis omnium fere vocalium, utcunque inter ſe diſſimilium, permutationes uſumque promiſcuum in ejuſmodi locis inveniamus. Ut. MONO. MONI. MONVMENTVM. HERCO. HERCVLES. PIGNE PIGNORA. OPTV. OPTIMVS. [*a*]

---

[a] Grut. 1055. 1. 171. 8. 499. 12. 204.

[b] Mar. Victorin. l. 1. Priſcian. l. 1. de num. lit.

[c] Inſcrip. Florent. p. 51. 22.

[d] Eraſm. de recte pronuntiat. p. 168. Lipſ. c. 12.

[e] Ibid. vid. etiam Mar. Victorin. l. 1. de Orthograph.

[f] Jo. Tortel. Orthograph. de litera. F. fol. 4. ib. 172.

[g] Grut. 643. 6. 886. 15. 911. 17. 757. 9.

[h] Grut. 334. 2. 757. 1. Inſcr. Flor. p. 172. 145.

Æ.

Diphthongos quod attinet, nomen ipſum naturam earum indicat: videlicet, cum binæ vocales in eadem ſyllabâ coeuntes ſono quodam duplici, ſed mixto & in unum quaſi conflato, proferuntur; ita tamen ut utriuſque etiam vim percipere queamus. Ejuſmodi vero ſonus cum non niſi difficulter, nec ſine oris labore quodam accurate exprimi poterat; uſus hominum communis, in mollitiem ſemper deliciaſque delabens, illum ita paulatim emollivit, ut diphthongos demum ad vocalium ſimplicium gradum revocaverit. Atque hinc in diphthongo Æ. omiſſa altera vocali A. & pro nihilo habitâ, in altera E Romanos olim conſtitiſſe, eamque unice expreſſiſſe reperio; quod marmora antiqua demonſtrant, in quibus diphthongus hæcce cum E vocali promiſcuè ubique uſurpata & commutata, tum in longis, tum brevibus etiam Syllabis occurrit. ut. ÆIVS. ÆXTÆRVM. VENÆRI. EDIFICIVM. EGYPTVS. PRETORIVM. [*b*] Undè ſonum utriuſque ſimilem ſeu eundem potius fuiſſe perſpicuum eſt. Sculptores enim, ut ſupra dixi, orthographiæ ignaros, non niſi aurium judicium, ſonique rationem in verbis deſcribendis ſecutos eſſe neceſſe eſt.

CONIVGIS SVE. [Camera ed Iſcrizioni ſepolchral. Inſ. 182.]
FILIAE QVE VIXIT. Inſcrip. Florent. p. 178.

Œ.

Hæc diphthongus per OI antiquitùs ſcribebatur, & utrovis modo cum V vocali confundebatur: ut COIRAVIT. COERAVIT. CVRAVIT. OIT. OET. VTILE. [*c*] Hujus autem affinitatis ratio explicatu mihi difficilis videtur: eumque ſcribendi morem apud priſcos ſolummodo Romanos obtinuiſſe, ac obſoleviſſe poſtea conſtat.

[*a*] Grut. 946. 6: 608. 2: 6. 2: 1052. 10: 329.

[*b*] Grut. 542. 2: 756. 2: Lipſ. de pronunt. Gr. 1053. 2: 376. 3: 28. 5:

[*c*] Ib. 59. 8: 100. 8: 499. 12.

Hanc enim diphthongum eodem modo ac ſuperiorem tractari, atque ad ſonum ſimplicem vocalis E redigi tandem reperio. Pro qua in inſcriptionibus perſæpè poſita occurrit. Ut EPHOEBVS. FOELIX. PROSCOENIVM [d] quibus in verbis propter E longam, ſonumque adeo ejus minime dubium, ſculptor in iis licet ſcribendis peccare, in ſonandis tamen nullo modo poterat.

Præterea diphthongos haſce Æ & OE. alteram pro altera nonnunquam poſitas cernimus, ut in familiarum nominibus. CAE. & COELIA. CAE. & COERANVS, CAE. & COESONIVS [e] ex quibus patet, apud Romanos olim, uti apud nos hodie, haud alium utramque ſonum ac vocalem E habuiſſe.

De reliquis diphthongis parum mihi lucis ex inſcriptionibus antiquis ſuppeditatur: eas autem ab Italis recte pronuntiari cenſeo, qui ita efferunt, ut utriuſque vocalis vis percipi clare & diſtingui poſſit.

AV. Diphthongo ſonum illi tribuunt latiorem, craſſioremque quam noſtra lingua agnoſcit, ejus vero non abſimilem, quem in verbo noſtro *owe* exprimimus; præſertim ſi ruſticorum more, ac ſi per a ſcriptum eſſet, pronuntiaretur, nos certe hanc dpihthongum mollius, quam par eſt, & ore nimis contracto efferimus. Galli vero omnium peſſimè, qui ei ſemper ſonum vocalis O adjungunt.

EV. Haud male a nobis pronuntiari exiſtimo, in vocibus latinis Euge, neuter &c. in noſtris ſhew. lewd. &c.

Æ. Conjugi ſue Julie Longine Fabrett. 83, ſine ulla litæ. 95.

Glæba & Gleba promiſcuè ſcribitur in antiquiſſimo Cod. Virgil. mediceo quem ipſe vidi Norr, 431.

C. Ante vocales A. O. V. eundem olim ſonum habuiſſe ac hodie habet certiſſimum eſt: qualem autem ante reliquas E & I, diphthongoſque AE. OE. EV. habuerit, haud ita convenit. Angli illam, Gallique etiam, haud ab S. diſtinguunt. in Cœna. Cæſar. Ceres. Cinis &c. at in iiſdem Itali, quod Romanos etiam feciſſe olim exiſtimo, eum huic literæ ſonum tribuunt, quo nos *ch* efferimus, in vocibus noſtris Cheek; Cherry, Cheap &c. itaque pronuntiant Cicero, uti nos Chicheſter; Chicheley, &c. ita tamen ac ſi ante C, cum in medio vocis ſequatur vocalem, litera T. leviter admodum & ſubobſcurè ſonanda interponeretur. Ut Citcero,

---

[d] 689. 4: 273. 6: 168. 10:

[e] 52. 6: 670. 8: 240: 122: 351. 3: 372. 1:

Chitcheſter. quam pronuntiandi rationem expreſſiſſe planè ſculptor quidam videtur, qui in inſcriptione veteri contra orthographiæ regulas T ante C interpoſuit in nomine Vrbitcius. [*f*] Hanc autem Italorum conſuetudinem Lipſius prorſus deridet, literamque C eandem prorſus vim ac K ante omnes pariter vocales obtinuiſſe contendit. [*g*] At virum doctum, Germanorum ſuorum ſonis nimis faventem, hoc in loco, uti alias ſæpè erraſſe conſtat. Nam etſi K ante vocales A. O. V. pro C. perſæpe ſcripta reperiatur. Ut Karcer. Kos. Kujus. &c. [*h*] ante reliquas tamen nuſquam ita poſitam animadverti; ex quo utrumque illud probari videtur, tum literas haſce eandem plane vim nonnullis in locis, tum diverſam quandam in aliis habuiſſe; atque hinc in Carcer. primam C cum K commutatam videmus, at ſecundam non item. In inſcriptionibus vero antiquis litera hæcce ante I in medio vocis ſequente altera vocali, nunquam, ut dixi, cum K, ſæpiſſime tamen cum T commutata cernitur. Ut Domicius. Palacium. Fabritius. Fetialis. Condicio. [*i*] cujus quidem permutationis in literis tam inter ſe poteſtate diſſimilibus nulla certe ratio reddi poſſet; ni utræque iis in locis poſitæ ſonum quendam tum inter ſe conſimilem, tum diverſum ab eo quem alibi obtinerent, habuiſſent. Nunquam enim aut earum permutatio aut ſoni affinitas aliqua cernitur, niſi ante I ſequente altera vocali. Quo in loco quum T. ſonuiſſe ut *Ts* infra oſtendetur, ſequitur plane C ſonum ei perſimilem habuiſſe, nec alium quidem ac quem ſupra indicavi, quemque Itali hodie illi iiſdem in locis aſſignant. Conſtanciæ. Fabrett. 102. dicionem. 169. condicio. 378. ſolacium. 421. negociantur. cenot. Piſ. p. 301. Numicius. iſius. 151. 11. v. 55.

G. Hanc literam omnes eodem modo efferunt ante A. O. V. ante ceteras vocales diphthongoſve mollius ea quiddam apud Romanos olim, uti apud nos hodie, ſonuiſſe videtur; contra omnino ac Lipſius diſputat; qui hanc omnibus conſonantibus regulam generalem conſtituit, videlicet eas eundem ſemper atque unicum ſolummodo cunctis æquè in locis ſonum obtinere; contenditque adeo G aliam nuſquam habere vim ac quam in voce lego. [*k*]

[*f*] Grut. 1059. 3.

[*g*] Lipſ. de Pronunt. lin. lat. c. 13.

[*h*] Grut. 80. 5. 607. 1.

[*i*] Ib. 689. 9: 232. l. 10: 101. 5: 457. 2: Ald. Orthog. p. 295.

At in marmoribus vetuſtiſſimis, cum jam litera hæcce nondum inventa ac inter latinas recepta eſſet, C pro ea uſurpatam videmus; ut in Duilliana illa LECIONES. CARTACINIENSIS. &c. [*l*] Et in multis etiam aliis ante vocales E & I. eam pro G poſitam animadverti. Ut MACESTERIVM. PRIMICENIVS. [*m*] quibus in locis cum literam C molliorem quendam ſonum, ut apud Italos, quem nos per ch exprimimus, obtinuiſſe probavi, ſequitur plane G etiam ſonum itidem mollem & conſimilem habuiſſe; eundem, opinor, quem Itali jam, noſtrique etiam in verbis legio, magiſtratus illi attribuunt.

GN. Cum literam G in medio dictionis ſequatur N. ut magnus. Itali alteram ei N in pronuntiando præponunt, atque I vocalem utriſque ſubjiciunt; deinde ipſi G ſubobſcurum admodum ſonum tribuentes, ita vocem ipſum efferunt ac ſi ſcriberetur Mang-nius vel Mannius. Quod Romanis etiam antiquis in uſu fuiſſe perſpicuum eſt: nam in vetuſtis quibuſdam inſcriptionibus, quo ſonus iſte melius exprimeretur, I poſt GN. interpoſitam nonnunquam animadverti, ut. MAGNIO [*n*] ABIEGNIEAS. [*o*]

Id vero a Græcorum conſuetudine profluxiſſe liquet, quos literæ Γ ſequente altera Γ vel X, K, Ξ. ſonum literæ N tribuiſſe cognovimus; ut ΑΓΓΕΛΟϹ. ΕΓΧЄΙΡΙΔΙΟΝ. ΑΝΑΓΚΗ. ϹΦΙΓΞ. Angelus. Enchiridium. Sphinx. atque hinc in inſcriptionibus Græcis ejuſmodi verba cum N interdum interpoſita ſcribi videmus. ut. ΑΝΑΝΚΗ. ΕΠΑΝΓΕΛΛΑΜΕΝΟϹ. [*p*] quam conſuetudinem latinos etiam ſecutos eſſe Victorinus oſtendit; [*q*] qui pro Agger Anger; Suggeſtum, Sungeſtum; Ancilia, Agcilia ſcribi oportere cenſet. Atque hanc denique pronuntiandi dulcedinem ſignificare mihi Cicero videtur. Erant, inquit, [*r*] noti, navi, nari; quibus cum IN præponi oporteret, dulcius viſum eſt ignoti, ignavi, ignari dicere.

MAGNIO. MAGNIVS. MAGNIA &c. Fabrett. Inſcr. an. p. 14. 249. 254. 292.

H. Non tam literam quam aſpirationis notam ſeu ſignum literæ validius intentiuſque proferendæ a grammaticis exiſtimari video. Scribit

---

[*k*] Ib. c. 14.

[*l*] Grut. 404. 1.

[*m*] 1065. 9: 107. 4.

[*n*] Inſcript. Florent. bis.

[*o*] Gr. 207.

[*p*] Inſcription. Florent. p. 22. l. 16.

[*q*] Mar. Victorin. l. 1. de Orthograp.

[*r*] Orator. p. 265.

Cicero, [*r*] veteres Romanos ea nuſquam niſi in vocali uſos itaque locutos eſſe, ut pulcros; cetegos; triumfos; Kartaginem dicerent. Quam conſuetudinem cum ipſe aliquandiu ſecutus eſſet, propter aurium tamen voluptatem ſe repudiaſſe tandem ac populo reliquiſſe dicit; fatetur autem nonnullis in vocibus vel aurium ipſarum judicio ſervari eam debere, ut in orcivios. otones. ſepulcra. lacrymas. Populum vero in hiſce aurium deliciis, ſonorumque differentiis dijudicandis haud ita delicatum atque elegantem fuiſſe conſtat: ſed cum uſus hominum, ut dixi, ad partem molliorem ſemper facilioremque delabitur, aſpiratio hæcce ob moleſtum quandam vocis intentionem negligi paulatim et tam in vocalibus quom conſonantibus nihili tandem haberi, cœpta eſt. Quippe in inſcriptionibus antiquis eam ſæpiſſimè tum in verborum initiis prætermiſſam, tum e mediis ſyllabis ejectam reperio. Ut Omo. Oneſtus. Eres. Tratia. Eleuterus. Eutycus. Aduc. Agatopus. Cyato. Trepto. &c. [*s*] Sepulchr. de ſer. 40. 46. At aliis contra in locis adjectam eam ſupervacaneè & contra orthographia leges interpoſitam ſæpe videmus, ubi nullam omnino vim habuerit neceſſe eſt. Ut. Heridanus. Hillyricum. Horiundus. Hornamentis. Amynthas. Ponthes, Protheſilaus. &c. [*t*] ex quibus omnibus Eraſmi ſententia minùs mihi firma videtur, qui TH eo ſemper ſono efferri oportere diſputat quo nos in voce noſtra *Theiſ* utimur; [*u*] apparetque potius, aſpirationem hancce parvam admodum ſeu nullam prorſus ſoni intentionem in uſu Romanorum communi vel vocalibus vel conſonantibus adjeciſſe quæ loquendi conſuetudo a Romanis ad Italos derivata omnem jam tandem aſpirationem e lingua prorſus Italica exterminavit. Anthiocus. Fabrett. p. 40. The-Teontas. 30. chorona, 123. Thyranno. 166. Tæodora. 341.

K.

Literam prorſus ſupervacaneam eſſe grammatici omnes fatentur, quippe nullam omnino vim ſibi propriam aut a litera C diverſam obtinet: nonnulli tradunt eam ante vocalem A propriè ac unice adhiberi ſolere ut. Kalendæ Karthago: at ejuſmodi diſtinctio parum mihi certa aut ſtabilis videtur, neque ullum ei locum, ſonumve peculiarem a veteribus aſſignatum reperio: in inſcriptionibus antiquis pro C, ut ſupra oſtendi, perſæpe poſita occurrit. *ut Karus.* 333. 9. *Kaput.* 214. *Kos.* 607. 1. *Kujus. &c.*

[*r*] Orator. p. 265. [*s*] 588. 9. 427. 1: 521. 7: 402. 4: Inſcript. Flor. p. 26. it. 29. it. 406. it. 431. Grut. 1056. 1. 302. 2. [*t*] Grut. 52. 12: 396, 1: 529. 7: 451. 6: 914. 6: 150. 7: [*u*] de pronuntiat. lin. lat. &c. p. 157.

PH. Eundem olim ſonum habuiſſe ac F. inſcriptiones veteres confirmant, in quibus alterum pro altero promiſcue adhiberi cernimus. ut AMFION. TRIVMFVS. PHIDELIS. [*x*]

Q. In literarum ſupervacanearum numero a grammaticis habetur. K & Q. inquit Priſcianus, [*y*] *quamvis figura & nomine videantur aliquam habere differentiam, cum C tamen eandem tum in ſono vocum quam in metro continent poteſtatem.* Exiſtimabatur olim vim literarum C & V conjunctam poſſidere, ideoque nonnulli QIS QAE. QID. pro QVIS. QVAE ſcripſerunt. [*z*] At eam cum V vulgò ſcribi videmus, nec aliter omnino ſonare ac C. cum qua eam perſæpe commutatam ac promiſcue uſurpatam reperimus. ut. ACVA. CVO. AQVITVR. MEQVM. PEQVNIA. [*a*] CVOTTIDIE. Fabrett. 272.

T. Ante I ſequente etiam altera vocali. uti in IVSTITIA. pronuntiatur ab Italis, tanquam TS, vel TZ. quod Romanos etiam veteres factitaſſe Papirius quidam grammaticus tradit. [*b*] At hunc pronuntiandi morem Papiriumque item ipſum vehementer irridet Lipſius, [*c*] neque alium prorſus literæ T. hoc in loco ac in ceteris omnibus ſonum tribui debere contendit. Quicquid vero ille diſputet, vel hoc uno marmore refutari exiſtimo, in quo CRESCENTSIANVS. cum S poſt T ad ſonum ejus plenius exprimendum interpoſitâ ſcribitur. [*d*] Illam autem T, quia leviter tantum & ſubobſcure, ut apud Italos hodie, pronuntianda eſſet, prætermiſſam alio in loco & per S ſolummodo repræſentatam a ſculptore cernimus. Ut VOLCASIVS. [*e*] Bonifatiæ. 299. Fabrett. amatius. amaſius. 603. comitius. icius. 617. Fabritio. Robertell. emend. p. 46.

X. Loco CS, vel GS a Græcis inventam atque a Latinis aſſumptum eſſe Priſcianus docet: [*f*] *qua carere potuimus*, inquit *Quinctilianus*, [*g*] *ni quæſiſſemus.*

---

[x] Grut. 125. col. 5: 285. 6: 943.

[*y*] l. 1. de num. literar.

[*z*] Vel. Longius de Orthograph.

[*a*] Grut. 593. 5: 786. 5: 138. 817. 12: 102, l. 7.

[*b*] Vid. Aldi Orthogr. p. 563.

[*c*] de pronunt. lin. lat. c. 14.

[*d*] Grut. 127. l. 1.

[*e*] Inſcr. Flor. p. 400.

[*f*] l. 1. de num. lit.

[*g*] l. 1. c. 4.

Y & Z.

Græcæ prorſus literæ ſunt; nec a Latinis uſquam, uti grammatici tradunt, niſi in Græcis quibuſdam nominibus uſurpatæ. ut HYLAS. ZEPHYRVS. &c. [*h*]

Omnes, qui de hac quæſtione ſcripſerunt, literam Y (quæ a Græcis Upſilon dicitur) ſonum vocalis V, Gallico more pronuntiatæ habuiſſe contendunt; eundem ſcilicet, quem eidem nos vocali tribuimus in vocibus Duke, Flute, Lute. Centyria. Fabrett. 175. Tyſcia ib. Vyrginem. 53. Olumpus. 175.

Chekuſque noſter præſertim *lumen ſonorum extinctum dicit, cum Y, uti* ſemper apud nos, *ad ſonum I traducatur.* [*i*] Attamen ea nonnunquam cum I commutata in marmoribus antiquis invenitur, ut NIMPHIS. BYBLIOTHECA. [*k*] At multo ſæpius, cum V, Ut ILLVRICVM. SVRIA. CENTYRIA. SATYRNVS. [*l*] Quod Eraſmi ſententiam confirmare videtur, qui hanc literam medium quiddam inter I & V Gallicam ſonuiſſe exiſtimat.

Z.

A Græcis accepta vice literarum S & D apud Latinos fungebatur: *ſi aſſumpta non eſſet*, inquit *Max. Victorinus*, [*m*] *pro Mezentius, ſcriberemus Meſdentius.* Quam ſcribendi conſuetudinem *Dores etiam inter Græcos ſecutos* eſſe conſtat; qui pro μελιζειν dabant μελισδειν. *Eos* vero ut pro Z non σδ modo, ſed δς etiam uſurpaſſe cognovimus; ita Romanos etiam idem feciſſe, idque ad Italos inde profluxiſſe veriſimile eſt, qui hanc hodie literam per *ds* ſemper efferunt.

[*h*] Max. Victorin. de lit.

[*i*] de lin. Gr. pronunt. p. 88.

[*k*] Grut. 36. 6: 475. 4. 27. 5: 45. 13: 422. 1.

[*l*] ib. 297:

[*m*] c. de lit.

PREFACE,

Dr. *MIDDLETON*'s
LETTERS
TO
Mr. *WARBURTON.*

LETTER I.

Dorcheſter, Sept. 11, 1736.

SIR,

YOUR Candor, I hope, has already prevented me in ſuggeſting ſome favourable Excuſe for my long Silence. The Truth, which is always the beſt Apology, is, that I was abſent from *Cambridge*, when your Letter arrived there; and though it was tranſmitted to me at this Place, yet it found me in no Condition to anſwer it, either to your Satisfaction or my own. I am here unprovided of *Tully*'s Works, and without the Help of my Papers to furniſh any Hints to me on the Subject; ſpending my Time ſuitably to the Taſte and Temptations of the Country, in Cards at home, and Sports abroad; yet I could not longer defer to pay my Thanks at leaſt for the great Entertainment, that it gave me; with Promiſe of further Payment, as ſoon as I am able.

The Point, that you undertook to make good concerning *Tully*, is, that *he did not believe a future State.* In Proof of which you maintain, that in *his Epiſtles onely*, of all his Works, we are to look for *his real Sentiments.*

This, tho' ſupported by you very ingeniouſly, is not, I own, agreeable to the Notion, that I had formed from my general Acquaintance with his Writings: And as I have not yet had Leiſure to make it the Subject of a particular Enquiry, ſo at preſent I can onely give my looſe and indigeſted Thoughts on the Matter; which I ſhall do very freely, and in the Method, that you have ſketched out to me.

You aſſign four Reaſons of the Difficulty of diſcovering *Tully*'s Opinions on the important Queſtions of Philoſophy. 1. The Character of the ancient Philoſophy in general. 2. The manner in which the *Romans* received the *Greek* Philoſophy. 3. The

Nature

Nature of that Philoſophy, which *Tully* eſpouſed; 4. The peculiar Character of the Man.

1. By the firſt, you mean *the double Doctrine* of the old Maſters; *the external, and internal*; the one for the Vulgar, the other for the Adept. But whatever Effect this had in *Greece*, where that Way of Teaching ſeems to have been drop'd long before *Tully*; it certainly had none in *Rome*, or at leaſt in *Tully*'s Writings: The End and Purpoſe of which was to explain to his Countrymen, in the moſt perſpicuous Manner, whatever the Ancients had taught on every Article, either of ſpeculative or practical Knowledge.

2. *The Romans*, you ſay, *were far from the Humour of the Greeks; and did not regard the Doctrine of the Sect, that they eſpouſed, as a Rule of Life, but a kind of Furniture onely for their Rhetoric Schools.* But I ſee no Ground for this Diſtinction; if there was any between them, the *Greeks* were certainly the more diſputatious, and, agreeably to St. *Paul*'s Character of them, more curious and fond of *every thing new.* *Cato*, you ſee, from the Teſtimony, that you produce, made the *Stoical Doctrine his Rule of living*; and tho' he is laugh'd at for it by *Cicero*, yet not for making Philoſophy his Rule, but that particular Philoſophy, which was incompatible with common Life.

There is a Letter from *Tully* to *Trebatius*, upon his turning Epicurean; in which he rallies him for his new Principles, which muſt neceſſarily ſpoil the Lawyer, as breaking thro' all the old Forms of ſecuring Faith and Property amongſt Men: and concludes, *that if he was ſerious in the Change, he was ſorry for it; if to make his Court onely to* Panſa, *he excuſed it.* (Fam. l. 7. 12.) This ſhews, that the Choice of a Sect was not thought a Thing indifferent, but ſuppoſed to operate in Life and Manners. If then, as *Tully* ſays, a great Part took up their Philoſophy *diſputandi cauſa, non ita vivendi*; yet this was not the Thing generally thought blameable. Nor was it peculiar to the *Romans*, any more than to the *Greeks*, or to any other People, *not to live up to the Rule, that they profeſſed*; juſt as we ſee it now in the Caſe of Religion, which a great Part in all Countries contend ſor very warmly, yet practiſe very coldly.

3. You make *the Nature of Tully's Philoſophy* another Source of Difficulty in finding out his real Sentiments. His Philoſophy was *of the Academy*; and whether of the old or the new, much the ſame. But when you call it *perfectly ſceptical*, you ſeem to confound it with a different Sect, whoſe diſtinguiſhing Character was to *doubt of every Thing:* Whereas the Principle of the Academy was onely *to ſuſpend their Aſſent*, till by examining all Sides of a Queſtion, they could diſcover *the probable.* For in ſpeculative Enquiries they diſclaimed *all Certainty*; and thought nothing ſo unworthy of a Philoſopher, as *a raſh Aſſent*, and the embracing for true what he did not comprehend. They imagined Truth and Falſhood to be ſo mix'd and blended by Nature, that it was extremely difficult, if not impoſſible, to ſeparate them entirely; that Probability was the utmoſt, that human Wit could arrive at. This therefore they made *their Rule*, both of thinking and acting. What the other Sects affirmed with Aſſurance, they made it their Taſk to confute or ſhew to be *uncertain*; taking from each ſtill what they liked, and following it, with this Difference onely; that what the others called *true*, they called *probable.*

This, of all others, was the moſt rational Way of philoſophizing; ſubjecting them to no Maſter, no Syſtem of Opinions; but leaving a Liberty to chuſe, after a free Enquiry, whatever was found moſt agreeable to Reaſon and Nature. But what is there in this to create Difficulty in diſcovering a Man's Opinions, whenever he thinks fit to declare them? It might create, perhaps, ſome Diffidence in declaring them; and a Diſpoſition, to confute rather what others aſſert, than to aſſert any Thing of his own: But their Rule ſtill was as certain and conſiſtent as of any other Sect; and when perſuaded, of any Opinion, they purſued it as regularly, and explained as freely as any of the reſt.

4. But the *Embarraſs*, you ſay, *is compleated by the peculiar Character of the Man*; which you conſider in three different Capacities, of *the Orator*, *the Stateſman*, *the Philoſopher*; and contend,

that he not onely contradicts in one, what he affirms in another, but *is inconſiſtent with himſelf, even when he ſpeaks from one and the ſame Perſon:* Yet from the beſt Attention, that I have been able to pay to his Hiſtory, I find in him but one general, conſiſtent, glorious Character, of a great and good Man, acting and ſpeaking on all Occaſions, what the greateſt Prudence with the greateſt Virtue would ſuggeſt.

As an Orator, it was his Buſineſs to inforce, with all the Power of Eloquence, whatever he thought ſerviceable to his Client, and uſeful to the Cauſe, that he was defending. Of this Part he acquitted himſelf with Glory; and tells us himſelf, what the Nature of the Thing would tell us for him, that we are not to expect his real Sentiments here.

As a Stateſman, the Caſe is ſtill the ſame. In his Harangues to the People he gives a different Account, you obſerve, of the ſame Fact, from what he had done in the Senate; that is, he adapts his Stile and Arguments to the different Genius of each Aſſembly; to engage them both the more effectually to promote the Meaſures, that he was then purſuing.

As a Philoſopher; if we join the Character of an Academic, we ſhall find him equally conſiſtent. For I cannot help agreeing with *Bentley*, in taking this *for the Key* of his philoſophical Writings, as much as I do with you, in your fixing the Time of his changing the Academy. This was the Philoſophy, that he profeſs'd through Life; and to which he profeſſes himſelf indebted for all his Succeſs in it: And this Clue will lead us through *that Labyrinth of Contradiction*, which you ſeem to diſcover in his Works.

In his Book of Divination, you ſay, *he combats all Augury*; but in his Book of Laws *declares for it*; *in a manner too ſerious to ſuſpect him of feigning*. Yet all the Matter is, that in the one he acts the Philoſpher; in the other the Stateſman: In his Treatiſe on Divination, he aſſerts and eſtabliſhes it in the firſt Book, in the Perſon of his Brother, by all the Arguments, that can be brought for it; and refutes them all in the ſecond, in his own

Perſon. This is the true Spirit of the Academy; after examining both Sides, to reject what has nothing ſolid in it. Yet in *his Treatiſe on Laws*, he recommends *Augury*; and no Wonder: for tho' he laughed at it as a Philoſopher; he had a great Opinion of it as a Politician: And always ſpeaks of *the Invention of its Ceremonies, and the making them Part of the civil Conſtitution, as an Inſtance of the greateſt Wiſdom and Prudence in their Anceſtors.* For it was wholly agreeable to that Scheme of Policy, which he conſtantly purſued from the Beginning to the End of Life, of throwing the chief Influence and Balance of Power in State Matters into the Hands of the better Sort.

Again you take Notice, that *in his Book on the Nature of the Gods*, he reflects on thoſe, *as too curious or impertinent*, who were calling upon him on all Occaſions to declare his own Opinion: *Qui autem requirunt, quid quaque de re ipſi ſentiamus, curioſius id faciunt, quam neceſſe eſt.* (l. 1. § 5.) yet *in his Academic Queſtions*, he ſwears, *that he always ſpeaks what he thinks: Jurarem—me et ardere ſtudio veri reperiendi, et ea ſentire, quæ dicerem.* (l. 4. § 10.) In the firſt of theſe Works, he profeſſes onely to collect what the old Philoſophers had taught; and, according to the Method of the Academy, to combat the Opinion of one Sect, with that of another, without declaring his own: So that the Difficulty of diſcovering it is not owing here, as you intimate, *to any obſcurity* in delivering it; but to his not delivering it at all. But *in the Academic Queſtions*, as far as I can underſtand the Paſſage without the Context to aſſiſt me, he does not ſwear, as you render it, *that he always ſpeaks what he thinks*, but onely, that *he thinks what he is there ſpeaking:* And if ſo, it confirms what I have been ſaying of the Academy, and its being *the true Key of his Sentiments.*

But you aſſert, *that his Sentiments are not to be collected from any of his Writings, that were deſigned for the Public, which include all but his Letters, becauſe, in all his Writings of that Kind, he affected an Obſcurity.* This is the firſt Time that I have ever ſeen the Character of *obſcure* apply'd to *Tully*'s *Writings:* Surely no Man's Stile was ever farther removed from it, or more remarkably ſhining

ing and perſpicuous, than his. But the whole Charge of Obſcurity, and all the Contraſt of Sentiments found in different Parts of his Works may eaſily be ſolved, by conſidering onely the different Circumſtances, in which they were delivered. By attending to this, we ſhall find his very Contradictions to be Conſiſtencies, and nothing elſe but what was prudent and proper to be ſaid by one and the ſame Man; acting the different Parts of the *Orator*, *the Stateſman*, *the Philoſopher*.

To come then at laſt to the principal Point in queſtion; the Diſcovery of *his real Thoughts concerning a future State, which are to be collected onely*, you ſay, *from his Epiſtles.* And ſo far I agree, that in familiar Letters we may expect to find him more open and undiſguiſed, and as far as he touches any Subject, treating it with leſs Reſerve, than in Works deſigned for the Public: Yet all his Letters, as you allow, are not of this Sort: In many of them it was his Buſineſs to ſay, not ſo much what was true, as what would pleaſe. But let us ſee what he has actually ſaid in the Teſtimonies, that you have produced from them. In a Letter to *Atticus*, (l. 4. 10.) *Sed de illa ambulatione, fors viderit, aut ſi qui eſt, qui curet, deus.* To *Torquatus*, (Ep. fam. l. 6. 3.) *Sed hæc conſolatio levis eſt: Illa gravior, qua te uti ſpero, ego certe utor: Nec dum ero, angar ulla re, cum omni vacem culpa: Et ſi non ero, ſenſu omnino carebo.* Again, (ib. 4.) *Deinde quod mihi ad conſolationem commune tecum eſt, ſi jam vocer ad exitum vitæ, non ab ea republica avellar, qua carendum eſſe doleam, præſertim, cum id ſine ullo ſenſu futurum ſit.* To *Toranius*, (ib. 21.) *Cum conſilio proſici nihil poſſit, una ratio videtur, quicquid evenerit, ferre moderate, præſertim, cum omnium rerum mors ſit extremum. Nothing*, you ſay, *can be more expreſs than theſe Paſſages againſt a future State: And that* Tully *ſpeaks in them his real Sentiments, there is not the leaſt room to doubt. They were Letters of Conſolation to his Friends, when he himſelf, by Reaſon of the ill State of public Affairs, moſt wanted Conſolation.*

As to the firſt of theſe Paſſages; you allow it to be *a Compliment to the Philoſophy of his Friend Atticus*, who was an Epicurean: And why is it not ſo too in the reſt? In the firſt to *Tor-*

quatas, as in that to *Atticus*, the Caſe is put hypothetically *ſi non ero:* And the very Uſe of ſuch a Topic in Conſolation, implies, that theſe Friends alſo were Epicureans, and that he was adminiſtering Comfort from their Philoſophy, not his own, as likely to have the more Weight with them; or arguing, as we ſay, *ad hominem*, not expreſſing his real Sentiments.

But as this is onely conjectural, and, as ſome may think, contrary to Fact; let us try what other Defence can be made, and what Uſe in this Caſe of our *Key of the Academy.* Though I have often reflected on theſe Paſſages, yet my Notion has always been, that *Tully did believe a future State.* The whole Turn of his Writings, and the Tenor of his Life ſhew it: He lived expecting it, and always, ſo as to deſerve it; and declares it to be *a favourite Opinion*; which, though poſſibly an Error, he was reſolved to indulge. But we muſt remember ſtill, that he was an Academic; that is, that he believed it onely to *be probable*; and as Probability neceſſarily admits the Degrees of *more and leſs*, ſo it admits a Variety likewiſe in the Stability of our Perſuaſion: And as *Tully* himſelf ſays, on another Occaſion, *quis autem eſt, tanta quidem de re, quin varie ſecum ipſe diſputet?* In a melancholy Hour, when the Spirits are low, and the Mind under a Dejection, an Argument appears in a very different Light; Objections acquire Strength; and what humours the preſent Chagrin, finds the readieſt Admiſſion. Theſe Paſſages were evidently of this Kind, written in his deſponding Moments; and, as you ſay, *when he himſelf moſt wanted Conſolation.* And if we allow them therefore to expreſs what he really thought at the Time, yet they prove nothing more, than that *he ſometimes doubted of what he generally believed*; conſiſtently with the Character and Principles of an Academic, who embraced *no opinions as certain.*

Thus, Sir, I have given you my free Thoughts on what you were ſo good as to communicate with regard to *Tully:* I will not be anſwerable for the Exactneſs of them; they are ſuch onely as my Recollection could furniſh, without the Help of *Tully*'s Works to refreſh, or any Teſtimonies to ſupport them. But as I reſerve the more exact Conſideration of this Argument to the Part of *Tully*'s Life, which was the moſt employed on Philoſophy, under *Cæſar*'s Tyranny, ſo I ſhall be obliged to you for imparting any further Thoughts on the Subject, either to confirm or confute what I have here offered: And if any Occaſion of Books or Friends ſhould invite you again this Winter to *Cambridge*, where I propoſe to be about *Michaelmas*, I beg you to be aſſured, that no Man will be more ready to ſerve you in any manner there, or better pleas'd to enjoy as much of your Company as your Time and other Friends will allow to,

Sir,

Your moſt obedient Servant,

CONYERS MIDDLETON.

P. S. I ſhould be glad to hear that your great Work goes on ſucceſsfully; and as a ſure Omen of ſatisfying others, that you find more and more Satisfaction from it yourſelf. When I was laſt in *London*, I met with a little Piece, written with the ſame View and on the ſame Plan with yours, An anonymous Letter from *Geneva*, evincing *the divine Miſſion of* Moſes, *from the Inſtitution of the Sabbatic Year.* The Author ſets out, like you, from this ſingle Poſtulatum, that *Moſes* was *a conſummate Lawgiver*; and ſhews that he could never have injoined a Law *ſo whimſical, impolitic and hazardous*; *expoſing the People to certain Famine, as oft as the preceding or following Year proved barren*; *if He, who has all Nature at command, had not warranted the Succeſs of it.* The Letter is ingenious and ſprightly, and dreſſes out, in a Variety of Colours, the Abſurdity of the Inſtitution, on the Suppoſition of its being human. It is in *French*, and publiſhed in *Bibliotheque Germanique*, Tom. 30.

But will not this Gaiety of cenſuring the Law be found too adventurous, and expoſe *your Poſtulatum itſelf* to ſome Hazard? Eſpecially when there is *a Fact*, generally allowed by the Learned, ed, that ſeems to overturn all this ſpecious Reaſoning at once; *viz. that this Law of the Sabbatic Year was never obſerved.* For if ſo, it may be objected, with ſome Shew of Reaſon, that *Moſes* had charged himſelf with the Iſſue of Events too delicate, and beyond his Reach, and imprudently injoin'd what Uſe and Experience ſhewed to be impracticable.

I am apprehenſive likewiſe, that your Work will not ſtand wholly clear of Objections: Your Scheme, as I take it, is to ſhew, that *ſo able a Man as* Moſes *could not poſſibly have omitted the Doctrine of a future State, thought ſo neceſſary to Government by all other Legiſlators, had he not done it by the expreſs Direction of the Deity; and that under the miraculous Diſpenſations of the Theocracy, he could neither want it himſelf for the enforcing a Reſpect to his Laws, nor yet the People for the Encouragement of their Obedience.* But what was the Conſequence? Why the People were perpetually apoſtatizing either to the Superſtitions of *Ægypt*, or the Idolatries of *Canaan*; and tired with the Load of their Ceremonies, wholly drop'd them at laſt, and ſunk into all Kinds of Vice and Profaneneſs; till the Prophets, in order to revive and preſerve a Senſe of Religion amongſt them, began to preach up the rational Duties of Morality, and inſinuate *the Doctrine of a future State.*

As in the other Caſe then, ſome may be apt to ſay, that *Moſes* had inſtituted what could not be practiſed without Ruin to the State; ſo in this, that he had overlooked, what could not be omitted without Ruin to Religion.

I have taken the Liberty to propoſe theſe Hints, that, if you think them of Weight, you may be better prepared to obviate them; if not, may proceed the more ſecurely by ſeeing Reaſon to ſlight them. As for myſelf, I can ſafely ſwear with *Tully*, that I have *a moſt ardent Deſire to find out the Truth:* But as I have generally been diſappointed in my Enquiries, and more ſucceſsful in finding what is falſe than what is true, ſo I begin, like him too, to grow a mere Academic, humbly content to take up with the *probable.* Whatever you have to offer me of this Kind, I ſhall thankfully embrace; and tho' I expect as much from you, as I do from any Man, yet in the arduous Subject, on which you are engaged, I dare not venture to raiſe my Expectations any higher.

LETTER II.

Cambridge, Nov. 30, 1736.

Dear Sir,

ON my Return to *Cambridge* my firſt and beſt Entertainment was to find a long Letter from you; which will ever give me Pleaſure in proportion to its Bulk. I am much oblig'd to you for your friendly Acceptance and Conſtruction of the Freedom with which I treated your Diſſertation on *Tully*'s Philoſophy, as well as of what I ventur'd to intimate in relation to your greater Work. By your large View of both Subjects you have ſet me right in ſome particulars, which I had advanc'd too haſtily and applied improperly; but I have neither Leiſure nor Ability at preſent to enter into a detail of them, as well for the Arrear of Buſineſs in which a long Abſence has involv'd me, as for a particular Diſorder and Flux of Rheum in my Eyes, which diſables me in great meaſure either from reading or writing, and makes it even difficult to diſcharge this preſent Duty towards you. I muſt refer my ſelf for a free Diſcuſſion of all Particulars to that perſonal Conference, which you are ſo good as to promiſe ſome time after Chriſtmaſs, which I ſhall enjoy with great Satisfaction and expect with equal Impatience.

I ſaw our friend *******, as I paſſed thro' *London*, whoſe Thoughts ſeem to be more employ'd on moral and religious Subjects, than on puſhing his Fortunes in his Profeſſion; in which I wiſh him all Succeſs, for I take him to be an honeſt and deſerving man. He profeſſes himſelf a warm believer of Chriſtianity;

I am ſorry that it is on no better Grounds, than what you mention: for it is in Opinions, as in Eſtates; our Poſſeſſion gives a preſumption of a good Title, till the Diſcovery of it oft betrays the Weakneſs of the Tenure. The Lives and Characters of the Fathers are more likely in my Opinion to ſhake a ſettled, than confirm a wavering Faith. For notorious Weakneſs will in many Caſes diſcredit a Teſtimony as effectually, as notorious Wickedneſs: and we generally find but too much Reaſon, in the moſt eſteemed of them, to charge either the one or the other. Our ingenious Friend ******** has, as you obſerve, rightly charg'd the ſource of Infidelity on the miraculous Hiſtory of each Teſtament: yet our Divines are continually haranguing upon it, as reflecting nothing but Luſtre and Brightneſs on the Evidences of both. But we need not wonder at the raſhneſs of our ordinary Divines, when the great *Rogers* has declar'd, as I remember, in one of his Sermons, that he could not believe the Truth of *Moſes*'s Pretenſions, were it not for the Confirmation given to them by the Goſpel. This I take to be a dangerous Aſſertion, that ſaps the very foundations of Chriſtianity; and ſuperſedes at once the whole purpoſe of your intended Work, by denying any original or intrinſic Character of Divinity to the Inſtitution of *Moſes*. The Pleaſure that I have in correſponding with many worthy and ingenious Friends in different Parts of the Kingdom, has oft ſuggeſted a Wiſh to me, that a Club cou'd be inſtituted of ſuch, who are us'd to think, and able to write, for the Diſcovery and Defence of Truth on every Subject, that affects either private or public Life, without regard to any Party or Intereſt whatſoever. But the difficulty is to find a ſet of Men ſo independent and diſintereſted, as to be qualified to engage in ſuch a Cauſe, or indeed to find a Society that would bear them. The Deſign however, in the corruption even of theſe Times, if executed with Prudence, and with due Reſpect to the Government and Conſtitution, might be of great Service towards mitigating the indiſcreet fierceneſs and prejudices both of Zealots and Sceptics, which ſeem likely in ſome time to endanger the public quiet.

As to the Life of *Cicero*, I hope to get thro' the firſt rough Draught of it by the next Spring: but then to reviſe, correct, and digeſt it all to my Mind; and eſpecially to read over all his Works, as I intend, for that purpoſe, will employ another year, before I can offer it to the public.

I hope your next Letter will bring the Confirmation of your promis'd viſit to our Univerſity, and fix a ſhort Day for our expecting you, where I ſhall always be proud to teſtify, that I really am, what I profeſs my ſelf to be,

Dear Sir,

Your faithfull Friend
and Servant,

C. M.

LETTER III.

Camb. Apr. 9, 1737.

Dear Sir,

THO' I find my ſelf in no ſmall hurry on the approach of my Journey to *London*, whither I propoſe to ſet forward on *Monday* or *Tueſday*, yet I was reſolv'd to ſnatch a moment for the payment of my thanks for your late obliging Letters, as well as the Journal, that came to my hands ſoon after the date of my laſt.— I had before ſeen the force of your critical Genius, very ſuccesfully employ'd on *Shakeſpear*, but did not know that you had ever tried it on the *Latin* Authors. I am pleas'd with ſeveral of your Emendations, and tranſcrib'd them into the Margin of my Editions, tho' not equally with them all. It is a laudable and liberal Amuſement, to try now and then in our reading, the Succeſs of a Conjecture, but in the preſent State of the generality of old Writers, it can hardly be thought a Study, fit to employ a Life upon; at leaſt, not worthy, I am ſure, of your Talents and Induſtry, which inſtead of trifling on Words, ſeem calculated rather to correct the Opinions and Manners of the World.

As to the *Plain Account*; I heard *Whiſton* ſay, that he told the Queen, that the Biſhop did not underſtand the Nature of the Sacrament ſo well now, as when ſixteen Years old. But for my Part, I have not, I own, ſo contemptible a notion of the Performance. We may obſerve thro' all ages, that there never was any rite or practice in the Church, deriv'd from the Goſpel, that in the courſe of a few Years was not ſo perverted from its primitive uſe, as to want to be recall'd to its firſt Principles, and ſet right again by the original Rule. The Author takes this to be the Caſe of the Sacrament, and ſeems to have reaſon, not onely from the practice of this, but even of the earlieſt times of which we have any notice. For example. All his Adverſaries appeal to *Juſtin Martyr*, who wrote within fifty Years of St. *John*, for a genuin Account of the matter. Yet in his time we find, that after Conſecration, *the Deacons diſtributed the Bread and the Cup of Wine, mixt with Water, and carried Portions to the Abſent.* [Apol. 1. p. 96. Edit. Thirl.] *Irenæus* declares *the mixture of Water*, to be the Inſtitution of Chriſt himſelf [*l.* 4. *c.* 57. *l.* 5. 2. 36.] and when ſome afterwards began to diſpute and reject it, *Cyprian* affirm'd it to be injoin'd to him by a *ſpecial revelation from Heaven* [Ep. ad Cæcil. 63.]. And *Theophylact* on his Comment on *John* 19. ſays *pudeſiant Armenii, qui aquam non miſcent.* This may ſhew how little we are to depend on Antiquity in the Caſe before us. I have no time to add more, but that I intend to return to *Cambridge* before the End of *May*, where I ſhall be heartily glad to receive you, and on all Occaſions to ſignify, that I am, with great Truth, Dear Sir,

Sincerely Yours,

C. M.

LETTER

LETTER IV.

Camb. Sep. 22, 1737.

Dear Sir,

I Began to be impatient to hear of your Health, and what you were doing, till I receiv'd your laſt kind Letter: and if there was Occaſion for any Apology on your Part, it cou'd onely be, for not favouring me with it ſooner. I ſhall always be deſirous to ſhew any Reſpect to your Friends; for that Character with me will be a ſure Proof of their Merit: but Dr. *Tailor* ſeems to be one of thoſe few, who want no Teſtimonial, and whoſe ingenuous Behaviour and Converſation will eaſily recommend him to the Eſteem of Men of Senſe. Pray let him know, that I think my ſelf oblig'd to him for his kind Rememebrance of me, and ſhou'd be glad of any Opportunity of cultivating his Friendſhip.

The Life of *Cicero* proceeds but ſlowly, thro' many Interruptions and Avocations: I had an unexpected one lately, by ſudden call to *London*, to look after the Maſterſhip of the Charter-Houſe; having been mention'd for it, without my Application, by Sir *Robert*, and ſome other Great ones: but on my Arrival in Town I preſently perceiv'd, that the D. of *Newcaſtle* had been before hand with them, in ſecuring it for one Mr. *Mann*, an old Friend and Companion of Ld. *Godolphin*. So that I return'd, as I have been forc'd to do before, with a few good Words from thoſe, who can as eaſily give good Things. I have made however a conſiderable Progreſs in my Work; and am drawing it out into a legible Form; and at your next Viſit to us, hope to give you a Peruſal of the whole, or at leaſt of a great Part of it. But as I find ſome Difficulty in pleaſing my ſelf with it, I ſhall not be in haſt to ſend it abroad; tho' whenever I do publiſh, am ſtill inclined, as you, and other Friends have adviſed me, to print it by Subſcription.

I promiſe my ſelf in the mean Time much Entertainment from your firſt Volume: and if you carry it to the Preſs yourſelf, ſhall expect that you make *Cambridge* your Way, and take up your Quarters with us; where on all Occaſions you will be as welcome as at home, and for any time, that you find convenient. I am pleaſed with the manner of your Addreſs to the Free-thinkers, and obliged to you for your friendly Intentions with regard to my ſelf: and tho' I ſhou'd be as proud to have the teſtimony of your Judgement and good Opinion as of any Man, yet I wou'd have you conſider, how far ſuch a Declaration of it may expoſe you to a ſhare of that Envy, which has lain and ſtill lies very heavy upon me.

I have never once look'd into the Review, *&c.* the Maxim, that you mention from it, is agreeable to the Principles of the Author, and to make Poſſeſſion and Eſtabliſhments a Teſt of Truth, the ſure way to baniſh Reaſon and Inquiry out of Society. If from particular and national Societies, we extend his Rule to the univerſal one of Mankind, what wou'd become of Chriſtianity itſelf, if a majority or novelty muſt be the criterion of true and falſe? we ſhou'd have nothing left, but to join with *Tindale*, and maintain it to be *as old as the Creation.*

I am, Sir,

Your affect. Friend

and Servant,

C. M.

LETTER V.

Feb. 8, 1737-8.

Dear Sir.

I Deferr'd my Thanks for your laſt obliging Letter, till I cou'd pay them at the ſame Time for the kind Preſent which you there promis'd, and which I have ſince receiv'd. But I have been forc'd ſtill to deferr them much longer than I intended, by a cruel Diſorder of my Eyes which ſeiz'd me unluckily juſt before the Publication of your Book, and quite diſabled me from reading it; tho', by the help of borrow'd Eyes, I have at laſt got through it. When *Tully*'s Writings were firſt ſpread through the World after his Death, a Spring broke out in one of his favourite Villas, which was found excellent for weak Eyes, and thought to be providentially ſupply'd to aſſiſt towards the reading of his Works. I wiſh that Providence, in whoſe Cauſe you are more ſpecially engag'd, had furniſh'd the ſame help to facilitate the Lecture of your Writings. I flatter my ſelf however that my Blindneſs is not of the Judicial kind; ſince no Man, I'm ſure, was either more deſirous to read, or more willing to be convinc'd by you than my ſelf; and tho' by my unhappy Diſability I have loſt ſome Share of the Pleaſure, and perhaps of the Conviction, which I ſhou'd otherwiſe have receiv'd from your Book, yet I reſolve to make it up by a more conſiderate and attentive Peruſal, as ſoon as my Eyes will allow me: I beg leave in the mean while to aſſure you, that I found it very entertaining, very ingenious, very learned.

This wou'd be Satisfaction enough to the generality of Authors, whoſe end of writing is not ſo much Truth, as Praiſe: But that, I know, was not your's, or at leaſt your primary End; for a Writer of your Genius will be allow'd without that Imputation, to enliven a dry Subject with the Embeliſhments of Learning. I have the Pleaſure alſo to tell you, that I'm exactly of your Mind in your Notion of *moral Obligation*; as well as in the two capital Propoſitions of your Book, *that the Doctrine of a Future-State is highly uſeful to Society*; and *that Magiſtrates have always inculcated it for the ſake of that Utility.* How much farther you will carry me I cannot promiſe, I wiſh it may be to the End; if not I ſhall not charge it either to your Fault, or my own: For we are told by great Authority, *that it is as neceſſary for the Mind to yield to the Evidence of what it perceives, as the Balance to the Weight*; and *impoſſible for it not to judge of Things accordingly as they appear to it*; and we learn from daily Experience, that different Tempers and Capacities form different Judgements of the ſame Thing: ſo that while my academic Complexion leaves me groveling perhaps in the mire of Doubt, or purſuing the faint Track of Probability, your more ſanguin Spirits, like the greater Myſteries, make you at once an *Autoptes*, and admit you to the joyous Regions of clear Day and Intuition. But I cannot help attending to what, as *Cicero* tells me, a *Sicilian* Wagg *Epicharmus* whiſpers, *Be on your guard, and do not believe, for thoſe are the Nerves of your Mind:* But leſt you ſhou'd ſuſpect that I follow onely Pagan Authority, *Clemens* of *Alexandria* quotes the ſame Paſſage, and adds either from himſelf, or perhaps ſome better Writer, that *Incredulity has done much good in the World, Credulity much Evil.*

But to return to your Book, as I have told you with great Truth that it pleaſes me in general very highly, ſo I think it the Part of a Friend to acquaint you with ſome little Objections, which I have either heard from others, or obſerv'd to it my ſelf. Some take Notice that you treat the Free-thinkers too roughly, and that your Addreſs to them is a Defiance rather and Declaration of War, than an Invitation to a Conference; not likely therefore to conciliate their Favour or Attention, which ought to be the Care of one who profeſſes to write for their Conviction.—Ld. *Shaftſbury*'s Raillery on Mr. *Locke* does not ſeem ſtrange to me; a Philoſopher, who at parting with Life, has nothing to preach but *it's Vanity*, certainly makes a poor Figure, by ſhewing that he was deceiv'd in the End, and miſtaken in the Uſe of it; and not that Life itſelf, but that his Pretenſions to Philoſophy were vain.—We are at a Loſs to know, why you rank the *Old-Whig* among the *Infidel-Writers*; we conſider him as writing onely on diſſenting Principles, againſt Teſts and Eſtabliſhments, and ſuppoſe *C——r* or *F—r* to be the Editor, who have not been thought Enemies to Reveal'd Religion. For want of taking Notes in running thro' your Book, and the preſent bad State of my Eyes, I cannot recover the Paſſages, where I ſeem'd to ſtick a little; I ſhall mention therefore but one or two which my Memory ſupplies. You will be cenſur'd perhaps for condemning the fam'd Paſſage of *Joſephus* ſo roundly, upon a Principle, which will hardly be found to be true, *viz. the unſociable Nature of that Religion,* not allowing a Communion with any other: But *Whiſton*, you know, makes *Joſephus a Chriſtian-Biſhop*, and though you will laugh here at the old Man, as I my ſelf alſo do; yet what will you ſay to the uncontested Teſtimony of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, which aſſerts *that all the firſt Chriſtian Biſhops of Jeruſalem, thro' a perpetual Succeſſion of* 15 *to the final Deſtruction of the City by Hadrian, were circumciſed Jews.*

By emending a Paſſage of *Tully*, you make him condemn *the ignorance of their Anceſtors, and Superſtition of the Prieſts in the Eſtabliſhment of their Religion*; and referr to it afterwards as to a Senſe allow'd and certain: yet as far as I can remember of his real Sentiments and conſtant Profeſſions thro' all his Writings, he perpetually applauds the wiſe Inſtitution of their religious Rites, as admirably adapted to the Genius of their Government and Service of the State. I am,

Dear Sir,

Your faithfull Friend
and Servant,

C. M.

LETTER

LETTER VI.

Camb. Nov. 18. 1738.

Dear Sir,

I Am oblig'd to you for your kind Inquiry after my Health; my Eyes are ſomewhat better than they have been, which is no ſmall Comfort in my preſent Taſk of writing; but in truth I may thank my ſelf in great Meaſure for what I ſuffer from them, and while I am teizing them every Day beyond their Strength, cannot reaſonably complain, if they often make me ſmart for it. I have been thinking however ſometimes to try the Experiment which you adviſe, and deſire therefore at your leiſure to have the Receipt of your Tobacco; tho' *ex fumo dare lucem,* ſeems to be an Attempt too bold for one of my Age. I have now an Amanuenſis with me tranſcribing my *Tully,* and might be ready for the Preſs in the Spring, cou'd I prevail with my ſelf to part with it ſo ſoon; if I keep it ſtill longer, it is not becauſe I am fond of it, but becauſe it does not yet pleaſe me, for whenever it does, I ſhall be glad to get rid of it. My Friends in the mean while begin to be preſſing for it, and adviſe a Subſcription, to which I ſeem now determined, eſpecially as I have got an additional Charge upon me ſince I ſaw you, two ſmall Girls, about eight Years old, who are now in the Houſe with me, left by an unfortunate Brother, who had nothing elſe to leave; but they are fine Children, and have gained already ſo much upon our Affections, that inſtead of being a Burthen, we begin to think them a Bleſſing to us; my Subſcription therefore is like to be of the charitable kind, and *Tully* to be their Portion. I begin to think of printing at this Place, where it will be moſt convenient to me, and where we have a Syndicate on Foot to regulate the Preſs, and bring it again into Credit and Order; and my

Neighbour *Thurlborn*, whom I am diſpos'd alſo to oblige, has been making Propoſals to me. But I ſhall not think of taking any Reſolution, till I can compute the Size and Charge of printing my Work, and ſee a little forward into the Liſt of Subſcribers; as far as I can gueſs at preſent, it will make a large Volume in 4^{to}, which being handſomely printed may demand a Guinea for the Subſcription Price. You will never be forgiven for your Preference of the INTERNAL Evidence, for that brings Reaſon into the Controverſy, which our old Champions wou'd gladly diſcard, finding Teſtimony and Authority, like the Cudgel or Quarterſtaff, the ſureſt Weapons to beat off, or knock down an Adverſary. But I did not expect to hear that Biſhops begin to rank you on the Side of the Enemy, tho' nothing is ſtrange from ſuch a Biſhop, who has juſt Learning enough to make his want of Senſe onely the more conſpicuous. — I wiſh that you wou'd ſpend ſome Part of the Winter among us at *Cambridge*, where I ſhou'd be glad to have your Judgement on the ſeveral Parts of *Cicero*'s Life; we keep up a regular Meeting every Night at the Coffee-Houſe, which is the onely Hour which I ſpend agreeably out of my own Houſe; Mr. *** who charges me to repay his Compliments, adds no ſmall Life to the Company, but the Pleaſure of it wou'd be much heightened by the Benefit of your Converſation. My Amanuenſis leads me on ſo faſt that I can hardly keep Pace with him, if I give him any Start; for as he writes, I reviſe, and inſert all the Authorities. I can only add our joint good Wiſhes for your Health and Proſperity, and am with great Truth,

Dear Sir,

Your affectionate Friend

and Servant,

C. M.

LETTER

LETTER VII.

Camb. Sept. 4, 1739.

Dear Sir,

I Should have paid my Thanks long ago for your laſt kind Letter, but that I have been extremely buſy, and ſtill am ſo in finiſhing my Book for the Preſs, whither I ſhall certainly commit it, about the Middle of the next Month. I am obliged to you for my Rt. Revd. Subſcriber, and the more ſo, for the Pains that it coſt you to draw him in. Epiſcopal Gold, like that from the Royal Hand, may help to cure the Evil, with which I am ſaid to be infected. I have now got fifteen of that Bench, one or two of whom were even my Solicitors, but cou'd not perſuade ſome of the reſt, that my Work was not levell'd againſt Religion. This Notion has been ſtrongly inculcated, and when in the Converſation, that I mention'd (with the A. B.) I took occaſion to urge the Folly as well as Malice of it, it was anſwer'd, that tho' it might prove falſe, yet it did not appear to be malicious, ſince the *Life of Homer* might juſtly give a Handle to ſuſpect the *Life of Tully.*

I can eaſily imagine, that you have ſuffered in the Opinion of that Perſon, and many others of the ſame Stamp, for your charitable Opinion of me; but the free manner with which you treat certain Characters and Opinions, which paſs for ſacred with all ſuch, is your fundamental and unpardonable Crime, and the reſt but overt Acts of a ſecret Malice and miſchievous Intent in it. You deſpiſe that Roundneſs of their Syſtems, into which they have collected all the Subſtantials of Religion, and by breaking thro' the Circle threaten to diſſolve the Charm. How can a Prelate, who in his primary Viſitation made it is Care to recommend the *Miſcellany* to all the Clergy, ever reliſh an Author of your Genius, whoſe End as well as manner of Writing is juſt the reverſe of that Scribbler's, to purſue Truth, where-ever you find it, and from the midſt of Smoak and Darkneſs to ſpread Light and Day around you? You will hardly mend the matter, as you ſay, by defending Mr. *Pope*; for tho' it be an Act of Juſtice, and a Taſk of all others the moſt laudable to defend a ſhining Character when injuriouſly attacked, and tho' it will ſhew the Ingenuity, Learning, and good Taſt of the Author, yet it will not be thought a clerical Work, ſuch as your *St—s* and *Ch—s* attempt, all whoſe polemical Fire and Artillery are levell'd againſt the Enemies of the Church; and a ſtupid Book againſt *Morgan*, or a Defence of the Fathers, eſpecially where they cannot be defended, are the ſure Means of making a Man firſt a Chaplain, and at laſt perhaps an Arch-biſhop. No, my Friend, as long as you can love a Man, becauſe he is amiable, and think him honeſt, who is not perhaps Orthodox, or a lover of Truth, who hates a pious Fraud and ſanctified Lie, you may enjoy the Comfort of a good Conſcience and good Company, but muſt not expect after a Life of Virtue and Study to ſlumber in the Stalls and refreſh your old Age in the Sunſhine of the Church. Pray preſent our beſt Wiſhes and Compliments to Dr. *Tailor*, whether married or unmarried, and accept the ſame to yourſelf from,

Dear Sir,

Your faithfull

and obedient Servant,

C. M.

LETTER VIII.

Camb. Jan. 7, 1739-40.

Dear Sir,

I Have been a ſhamefull Time in your Debt for a kind and agreeable Letter, for which I have no other Excuſe to make, but that I have been forced of late to take the ſame Liberty with all my Friends, and content my ſelf with the leſs honorable Part of receiving Favors inſtead of giving.

I thank you for the Preſent of your Vindication of Mr. *Pope*, which my Wife read over to me with much Pleaſure to us both, and with that Satisfaction which your Works will always give your Friends of ſeeing you triumph over your Adverſaries. —— You have evinced the Orthodoxy of Mr. *Pope*'s Principles, but like the old Commentators on his *Homer*, will be thought perhaps in ſome Places to have provided a meaning for him, that he himſelf never dreamt of. However if you did not find him a Philoſopher, you will make him one, for he will be wiſe enough to take the Benefit of your Reading, and make his future Eſſays more clear and conſiſtent. It was certainly a generous Part in you, and worthy a Man of Capacity and Leiſure to vindicate a Writer of his Genius, to whom the Public is ſo highly indebted from the groundleſs Cavils of a dull Critic, which Mr. *Pope*'s Name and not his own had ſpread into every body's Hands. I have been employing my ſelf very diligently on the laſt Part of my Work, the Review of *Cicero*'s Character and Opinions, *&c.* where as it ſeemed to fall in my way to ſay ſomething by way of Note on the Article you wrote of, ſo I have taken the Opportunity of ſaying what I think ſufficient, yet no more than what the Subject naturally led me to. I think you much in the right to take no farther Notice of *W—r* you have done him too much honor already by letting him ſee that he can warm you. But I ſhall not be diſpleaſed to ſee you give the whole Tribe of them that juſt Correction in your Preface, which your maſterly Hand is ſo well able to diſpenſe. I am,

Dear Sir,

Your moſt obedient Servant,

C. M.

LETTER IX.

May 8, 1740.

Dear Sir,

I Am oblig'd to you for the favor of your kind Letter, and much pleas'd with your excurſion to *Twickenham*, which abounds with every thing, I know, that can make the Scene agreeable to a Man of Taſt, both within and without Doors. I thank you for doing me Juſtice to Mr. *Pope* and Mr. *Littleton*, and repreſenting me in that very Light, in which I deſire and ſhall ever endeavour to appear to Men of Probity and good Senſe, of what Party ſoever they may be; for I am perſuaded, that there are ſuch Men to be found in all Parties. I do not recollect how I cou'd ever anſwer an Invitation from Mr. *Pope* in a ſlight manner, whoſe Character would make ſuch a Behaviour ridiculous in any Man. I have always had a very high Opinion of his ſhining and ſingular Abilities; but from the Prejudices, conceiv'd againſt me by many of his Friends, on the Account of my Writings, as well as my Engagements to Ld. *Hervey*, I have had Reaſon to believe, that he alſo has been induced, to think me leſs worthy of his good Opinion, than he had once imagined. I am ſorry for your particular Loſs in Bp. *Hare*, whom I have always taken to be a real Encourager of Learning, as well as a learned Man; a Character, that will not eaſily be replaced on that Bench. But the Comfort is, that Learning is a Branch of Virtue, that never fails to carry its Reward with it; of which you have ſuch a Share, as you wou'd not exchange, I dare ſay, for the beſt Preferment in the Kingdom. This is a Satisfaction, which I feel every Day in my Study, in the want of all Preferment; that I can live after my own Way, without attending Levees, and expoſing my ſelf to Diſappointments, or ſacrificing, what is of all things the moſt precious to a declining Life, my Time to a vain Ambition. The elder Mr. *York*, with his Tutor *Salter*, left us ſuddenly upon a Summons to Town, where you will probably take an Opportunity to wait upon him. Pray contrive to ſee us on your Return, and ſpend as much Time with us as you can, where you may aſſure yourſelf of being always heartily welcome to, Dear Sir,

Your affectionate Friend

and Servant,

C. M.

LETTER X.

Camb. Jan. 8, 1740-1.

Dear Sir,

THE ſhort Day which my Bookſeller has fixt for the Publication of my *Cicero*, has thrown me into no ſmall Hurry, to provide all things ready on my Side before the End of this Month; I hear from all Friends, that you are not leſs aſſiduous in puſhing forward your Work, and as I propoſe

poſe to be in *London* in *February*, heartily wiſh, that it may be in ſuch forwardneſs, as to call you thither alſo about the ſame Time.

Our People here have juſt got ſome Notice of my Letter to the A— B—p which is ſpread as uſual thro' the Univerſity. His Grace, it ſeems, ſhewed it lately to Dr. *M—y* who gave a particular Account of it to a Fellow of *Sidney*, but with no Intimation of any Reflection made upon it either by his Grace or the Doctor, which is the whole that I have yet learnt of it. My firſt Comfort is, from the Reſerve obſerv'd about it, after ſhewing it to Enemies, that they are at a Loſs how to draw any thing from it to my Diſadvantage, and for the reſt, I am perfectly eaſy. —The Church has receiv'd a great Loſs by the Death of Dr. *W—d.* I cannot ſay, an irreparable one, whilſt *C—n* lives; to whom he has left ſome unfiniſh'd Papers *on Infant Communion*, and wiſely order'd all the reſt to be burnt; he has bequeathed likewiſe to the College, ſuch of his printed Books, as they find ſcribbled by his own Hand, for ſuch, I hear, is his own Deſcription of them. By the Silence of the public Papers upon the fall of ſo eminent a Luminary, we are to expect, I imagine, in a proper Time ſome labored Panegyric from a maſterly Hand. Tho' the great *Hooker* ſeems to have exhauſted himſelf in an Effort of the laſt Week to do Juſtice to the Character of the excellent *Euſebius*, who is preparing to give the *Coup de grace* to that ſubtle and ingenious but infamous Writer, the moral Philoſopher.—But as to *W—d* whenever they think fit to oblige the Public with his Life, they will not forget one Story, I hope, which is truly worthy of him, and ſhews the real Spirit of the Man, and which I can venture to tell you on good Authority. In his laſt Journey from *Cambridge* to *London*, being attended by Dr. *P———e* and *C——n* the Surgeon, he lodged the ſecond Night at *Hodſden*, where being obſerv'd to have been coſtive on the Road, he was adviſed to have a Clyſter, to which he conſented. The Apothecary was preſently ſent for, to whom Dr. *P———e* gave his orders below Stairs, while Dr. *W—d* continued above; upon which the Apothecary cou'd not forbear expreſſing his great Senſe of the Honor, which he receiv'd, in being call'd to the Aſſiſtance of ſo celebrated a Perſon, whoſe Writings he was well acquainted with; the Company ſignified ſome Surprize to find a country Apothecary ſo learned; but he aſſur'd them, that he was no Stranger to the Merit and Character of the Doctor, but had lately read his ingenious Book with much Pleaſure, *The Divine Legation of Moſes*; Dr. *P——e* and a Fellow of *Magdalen* there preſent, took Pains to convince the Apothecary of his Miſtake, while *C——n* ran up Stairs with an Account of his Blunder to *W—d* who provoked by it into a violent Paſſion, call'd the poor Fellow a Puppy, and Blockhead, who muſt needs be ignorant in his Profeſſion and unfit to adminiſter any thing to him, and might poſſibly poyſon his Bowels; and notwithſtanding Dr. *P——e*'s endeavours to moderate his Diſpleaſure, by repreſenting the Expediency of the Operation, and the Man's Capacity to perform it, he wou'd hear nothing in his Favor, but order'd him to be diſcharged, and poſtpon'd the Benefit of the Clyſter till he reached his next Stage. With ſuch wretched Paſſions and Prejudices did this poor Man march to his Grave, which might deſerve to be laugh'd at, rather than lamented, if we did not ſee what pernicious Influence they have in the Church, to defame and depreſs Men of Senſe and Virtue who have had the Courage to deſpiſe them.

I am with true Eſteem and our joint Wiſhes of many happy Years,

Dear Sir,

Your affect. Friend

and Servant,

C. M.

LETTER XI.

Camb. Apr. 5, 1741.

Dear Sir,

I Returned to *Cambridge* on *Friday* laſt, where I had no ſooner been welcomed by the affectionate Salutations of my Family than I receiv'd the additional Pleaſure of your kind Letter. I was quite tired of the Town before I left it, and called ſometimes at *Gyles*'s in hopes of being refreſhed by the expectation of your Arrival, but you reſolve, I perceive, to make your Appearance firſt by Proxy, and to oblige the World, with the Entertainment, which it impatiently expects, from the Publication of your ſecond Volume; to which I heartily wiſh all the Succeſs, that you deſire, or what, I am perſuaded, is ſtill more, all that it will really merit. —— I am oblig'd to you for your Congratulation on the favorable Reception of my Work, which has anſwered indeed all my Wiſhes, and you will readily believe, that I eſteem it as a particular Honour, that it has merited the Approbation of your Friends Mr. *Pope* and Mr. *Littleton,* with whom I ſpent a very agreeable Afternoon at Mr. *Murray*'s, where they both joined in ſtrong Expreſſions of their Friendſhip and Eſteem of you. As to the Circumſtance, from which you draw ſo juſt and uſefull a Leſſon, of our differing from each other in ſome particular Opinions, as I was always perſuaded, that it cou'd not have any other Effect upon you, ſo I have the Comfort to aſſure you, that I never felt the leaſt Impreſſion from it diſadvantageous to our Friendſhip; it is the neceſſary Conſequence of that Privilege of our Nature, on which all Men of Senſe ſet the higheſt Value, the Liberty of judging for ourſelves; yet ſince it wou'd be a great Satisfaction to me in all Caſes to find my Judgement confirm'd by yours, ſo when you are at full leiſure I ſhou'd be glad to know the particular Reaſons which force you to differ from me on the Subject of *Cicero*'s Opinions, to which alone our Difference in the preſent Caſe is to be referr'd, that as far as is poſſible we may come ſtill nearer to each other.

We have been alarmed in the Univerſity for ſome Days paſt by an Oppoſition declared againſt Mr. *Finch*, but it is now dropt, and we ſhall chuſe our old Member again to-morrow.

As ſoon as I can ſit down again to my Books, I ſhall prepare a new Edition of my Letter from *Rome* in 8vo, enlarged with a prefatory Anſwer to a Popiſh Writer, who has animadverted upon it, where I ſhall take Occaſion to explain my Sentiments more explicitely with regard to my Belief of the Scriptures, in a manner proper to ſatisfy all reaſonable and candid Readers, and for the reſt, it wou'd be a Weakneſs in me to expect or deſire that I ſhou'd ever ſatisfy them. I ſhall depend on your paying us a Viſit either as you go or return from *London*, for I have many things to talk over with you, which I cannot commit to Letter. I deſire you to make my Compliments to Dr. *Taylor*, with my Thanks for all his Favors, and to aſſure you that I am with the greateſt Truth,

Dear Sir,

Your ſincere Friend

and faithful Servant,

C. M.

LETTER XII.

Camb. Oct. 22, 1741.

Dear Sir,

YOUR obliging Letter found me at *Hilderſham* where I ſpent the Autumn with my Family, and where the Amuſements of the Country and the Neceſſity of reforming a rude Farm into a tolerable Habitation engroſſed my Time and Thoughts ſo intirely, as to leave me neither Leiſure nor Inclination indeed to take a Pen in Hand for any other Purpoſe but to draw Plans and ſettle Accounts with my Workmen. I return'd to *Cambridge* on *Saturday* laſt, and have taken my Seat again in my Study, where it ſhall be my firſt Taſk to pay my Debts to all my Friends for their Favors not yet acknowledg'd, and eſpecially to yourſelf, whoſe Letter I aſſure you, gave me a particular Pleaſure, as it furniſhed a freſh Proof not onely of your Candor and good Temper, but of your Friendſhip alſo to me; and whenever you may find Occaſion, as you intimate, to publiſh any Obſervations upon my Poſtſcript, I make no Doubt, but that you will give the Public the ſame Reaſon to applaud your Moderation, and ſet them ſuch a Pattern, of what we call polemical Writing, as ought to be copied by all Men of liberal Education. But whenever you think fit to give yourſelf that Trouble, you will remember, that the Point, which you aſſert, and the ſingle Point conteſted in the Poſtſcript, is, that the Papiſts, or the Introducers of thoſe Rites, which we call Popiſh, had no View or Reference to Paganiſm in the Introduction of them, and that in fact there were none of them introduced, while there were any Pagan Prejudices ſubſiſting among Chriſtians. If you make out this Point, (and nothing leſs can be thought to juſtify, what you declare in the Paragraph referr'd to by me,) you will have the Credit of diſcovering a Truth, unknown, I believe, before to the learned World. I am far from imagining, that you had the leaſt Intention of diſcrediting any Argument againſt Popery, which you took to be a good one, and I may perhaps have ſaid too much, in charging your Opinion with overthrowing *the Uſe* of my Book; but it muſt needs hurt *the Credit* at leaſt of a Work, that has been well receiv'd, to inform the Public that it is grounded at laſt on a Miſtake; and tho' it may happen to wound the Papiſts, that it hits them, as it were onely by Chance. You take Notice, that what you have ſaid on the Queſtion in Difference between us, was eſſential to your Argument, but I can aſſure you, that it was the general Opinion of all my Acquaintance, who reflected upon it, that you had ſtept out of your Way, to give a Blow to the Aſſertors of the Paganiſm of *Rome*, and for that very Reaſon were not ſo clear and connected in the Concluſion of that Section, as in the reſt of your ingenious Work. I am much pleaſed, that any Part of my late Performance can deſerve your Approbation, and eſpecially thoſe Pages which you mention. I was ever ready to have given the ſame Satisfaction, when it ſhould fall naturally in my Way, and belonged to my Subject, as I told you, I remember, when you were ſo kind as to adviſe me to it, but I cou'd not ſubmit to do it, on the Demand of a *V——n* or a *W——r*, which wou'd have expoſed me onely to freſh Cenſure and a more reaſonable Suſpicion of me. I am glad to hear, that any Occaſion will call you to Town this Winter; you call it indeed a ridiculous one, but if I gueſs it aright, it may one Day produce ſomething ſerious to your Advantage. For as Times now go, *Horace*'s Rule of Comic Wit, may not improperly be applied to our Conduct in Civil Life, and the ridiculous Part do your Buſineſs more effectually than all the Merit of your graver Character. *Ridiculum acri fortius ac melius*, &c. I received lately a very friendly Letter from Dr. *Tailor*, for which I deſire you to pay him my Thanks and Compliments till I find Leiſure, which I want at preſent, to acknowledge it my ſelf. Mr. *Tunſtall* carried his

Election yeſterday more clearly than was imagined, by a Majority of 23, his Number of Votes being 160. I beg your Acceptance of our joint Wiſhes of Health and Happineſs to you, and am with true Reſpect,

Dear Sir,
Your affect. Friend
and Servant,
C. M.

Three Letters of Dr. MIDDLETON's to another of his Friends.

LETTER I.

Cambridge, Nov. 19, 1747.

Dear Sir,

I Have been ſo particularly engaged ever ſince I was favored with yours of the 5th Inſtant, that I have not found leiſure till now, to thank you, as I ſhould otherwiſe have done much ſooner, for your clear and diſtinct Account of Dr. *D—n*'s Book, which was very agreeable to me, as it is an actual Exemplification of the Argument of the *Introductory Diſcourſe.*

I have formerly been acquainted with ſeveral Non-Jurors of diſtinguiſh'd Learning in this Univerſity, whom I always perceiv'd to be fond of the ſame Principles, which you have extracted from theſe *Catechiſms*; and to be arriv'd ſo near to the Confines of Popery, as if they were prepar'd to ſtep into it again, whenever a proper Occaſion ſhould intervene; which many of them would defend, as a more eligible Step, than an Union with any other Proteſtant Sect, as being more remote ſtill from the Primitive Pattern. Theſe Principles I could never digeſt, from the Time when I began to think and judge for my ſelf; and they gave me the firſt Diſguſt to what was then ſanctified by the Title of Orthodoxy. Nor has the Authority of thoſe ancient Fathers, from whom they are derived, alter'd my Opinion of them; nor can any Authority indeed ever perſuade me to receive as ſacred and divine, what my Senſe and Reaſon declare to be abſurd and ſuperſtitious. Yet this is the Religion, which Primitive Antiquity recommends to us. But it is a Comfort to obſerve, as well of our Clergy, as the Laiety, that they are generally become more eaſy and moderate in their Notions of Religion, than they have formerly been, from that more free and natural way of expounding its Doctrines, which has obtained of late years, not onely in the eſtabliſhed Church, but in all the prudent and ſenſible Part of our Proteſtant Sects; who all ſeem now to agree in making our common Senſe and Reaſon the genuine Teſt and Meaſure of our common Faith; which is the onely Way to preſerve any Peace or Charity among Chriſtian Societies. This good Fruit will be improved ſtill, I dare ſay, by the Choice of our new Archbiſhop; I may ſay, of the two Archbiſhops, who ſeem both to be of a Character quite oppoſite to the laſt; Men of an open and candid Diſpoſition, and Lovers of Liberty both religious and civil.

As to the Expectations, which you mention, from me, I have promiſed a Work indeed to the Public, of which I will not diſappoint it; but cannot tell as yet, in what Time I ſhall be able to ſend it abroad. Expectation is an Adverſary, againſt which I muſt guard it with the more Care; and the Argument is important, which will require therefore the greater Attention, and the Alarm, which it ſeems to have given to many, will oblige me to clear it of all Offence, except ſuch, as plain Fact and Truth may poſſibly give: And let that reach as far as it will I ſhall have no Concern for the Conſequences.

In the mean while I ſhould be glad, if you can ſend me any Information relating to the Subject, or any thing, which you may have heard worth Notice concerning the Sentiments or Apprehenſions of Men of Senſe about it; and when you paſs by *Manby*'s Shop, I deſire, if *D——n*'s Book be ſold in Town, that you would order him to ſend it to, *Dear Sir,*

Your affectionate
and faithfull Servant,
C. M.

LETTER II.

Camb. Decem. 15, 1748.

Dear Sir,

I Am aſhamed to find my ſelf ſo late in acknowledging the Favour of your laſt obliging Letter, and the litterary Notices, which you therein furniſhed for the Uſe of my Book. But I beg you to be aſſured, that the Tardineſs of my Thanks did not procede from any Diſregard to you, for whom I have long conceived a very juſt Eſteem; nor yet from any ſlight Opinion of the Authorities, which you had collected; but from my own Indolence and Diſinclination to writing Letters, contracted by the Interruption, which it gives to my few Hours of Study, and the Difficulty, which it creates to my weak Eyes, which will not ſuffer me to write or read what is neceſſary to the Taſk, to which I have devoted the Remainder of my Days, of informing my ſelf, as well as I am able, of any thing, that is right and good, and of communicating that Information to the Public, as being the ſole Way, which my Condition of Life has opened to me, of doing any good in the World, or making a proper Uſe of theſe ſlender Talents, with which Providence has intruſted me.

As to your Authorities, tho' I made no Uſe of them in my Work, which was quite finiſhed before they reached me; they may probably be of Service hereafter, for the Defence and Confirmation of my Argument againſt the Cavils of Adverſaries, who will not fail to attack it where-ever they can find a weak Part; as I am not ſo vain, as to think, that any Performance of mine can be clear of ſeveral Parts of that ſort. I ſhould be very glad to hear your free Sentiments upon it, as well as what Reception it meets with elſewhere; and eſpecially what Objections are made by Men of Senſe to my Part, where it is thought defective in matter of Proof or Probability.

The Duke of *Newcaſtle* was yeſterday elected our Chancellor with great Chearfulneſs and Unanimity. Dr. *Whalley*, our Regius Profeſſor of Divinity, died the Night before of an Apoplectic Caſe, in which he lay convulſed for a Day or two. The Candidates mention'd for the vacant Profeſſorſhip are Dr. *Paris*, Maſter of *Sidney* College, Mr. *Green*, Fellow of St. *John*'s, and Mr. *Young* of *Trinity*, our public Orator, all of them Men of good Merit and Principles. I am, with great Truth,

Dear Sir,
Your faithfull Friend
and Servant,

C. M.

LETTER III.

Jan. 16, 1748-9.

Dear Sir,

YOUR Letter of the 10th Inſtant gave me no ſmall Satiſfaction, by aſſuring me of the general Concurrence of the candid and judicious in their favourable Opinion of my late Work. The Approbation of Men of that Character is all, that I deſire, and what the Conſciouſneſs indeed of my own Conviction gave me ſome reaſon to expect. The Caſe is much the ſame in this Univerſity, where, as far as I am informed, my

Book has ſpread a general Perſuaſion of the Truth of what I affirm in it; and, what is ſtill leſs to be expected in ſuch a Place as this, without giving any ſort of Offence by any Part of it, which has yet been taken Notice of; tho' there are ſome cautious People always among us, who affect a Reſerve and Silence on Subjects of this Kind, till they are inſtructed from abroad in what manner they ought to treat them.

Mr. *Jortin*, whom you mention, is a very worthy, learned, and judicious Man; yet had no reaſon, I think, to expect in my Work any Notice of that miraculous Story concerning the Attempt to rebuild *Jeruſalem:* And your Anſwer on that Occaſion was the very ſame, which I had given my ſelf, when my Sentiments were aſked upon the ſame Fact.

In drawing up my Remarks on that Miracle, which *Berriman* defends, I had got a Notion of ſome Objections made to the Reality of that Caſe of the *Ipſwich* Woman, ſo as to render it of dubious Credit; which made me unwilling to venture upon it. But I have ſince been convinced, that the Fact was indiſputably atteſted; and that the Tranſactions of the Royal Society would have ſupplied an Inſtance as ſtrong and direct to my purpoſe, as that, which I borrowed from the *French* Academy.

The Notices, which you communicate, concerning Mr. *Dodwell*, *Joſeph Mede*, *&c.* may be probably of Uſe to me hereafter: and ſince the Publication of my Book, I have found the Character of St. *Jerom* treated with much Freedom by ſome of our Orthodox Divines and Lovers of Antiquity, and among them by Dr. *Cave* himſelf. I had prepared a Note or two likewiſe for my *Introductory Diſcourſe*, which I forgot afterwards to inſert, concerning the Opinions of ſome of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Divines, which I collected from *Strype*, who tells us in his *Annals*, that one *James Calfhill* (*), a Man much eſteemed for his Knowledge

---

(*) He was firſt Student, and afterwards Canon of *Chriſt Church Oxford*, Dean of *Barking* in *Eſſex*, and Archdeacon of *Colcheſter*, and nominated by Queen *Elizabeth* to the Biſhopric of *Worceſter*, but died before his Conſecration in *Auguſt* 1570. The Paſſage referr'd to in Dr. *Middleton*'s Letter is in p. 23, of his *Anſwer* to *John Martial*'s *Treatiſe of the Croſs*; which Anſwer was printed at *London*, in 1565 in 4to.

of the Primitive Fathers, declared, that he had read them all, and ſtrictly examined their Words and Aſſertions, from the very firſt Doctors of the Church after the apoſtolic Times, and had found *Imperfections in them all*; which, for the Reaſon given by Mr. *Dodwell*, he was unwilling to expoſe.

Manby has ſent me down four ſmall Pamphlets propoſed to come out weekly, call'd *The Mitre and Crown*, *&c.* in which I find my ſelf and my Work abuſed with great Rage and Virulence of Language, but without any Argument, that touched the Point in Queſtion. I ſhould gueſs the Writer to be ſome Nonjuring Divine, who writes partly for Bread, and partly for the Orthodox Cauſe of that antient and hereditary Right, which would give us both our Kings and Biſhops from *Rome*.

I paid your Compliments to Mr. *Green*, who will be choſen our Divinity Profeſſor this Week, without any Competition, after a probationary Lecture, which he is appointed to read on certain Texts of Scripture in the public Schools, on *Thurſday* next. He is a very ingenious Man, of good Temper and Principles, and will fill the Chair, I dare ſay, with Credit. The new Maſter alſo of *Peter Hoſue*, Dr. *Keen*, is a very ſenſible and agreeable Man, and likely to make an uſeful Hand both to the College and the Univerſity. By Dr. *Heberden*'s Removal from us I have receiv'd a great and particular Loſs, which I ſhall ever feel, tho' the Senſe of it will be much abated, to hear of its being attended with all the Succeſs on his Part, that I wiſh. One Advantage he is ſure to meet with, and for which alone I ſhall envy him; I mean that Choice of good Company, with which *London* always abounds.

Pray make my Compliments to all Friends, and believe me with great Truth, *Dear Sir*,

Your faithfull

and obedient Servant,

C. M.

To

To Mr. VENN.

Camb. Feb. 23, 1734-5.

SIR,

I Have been well informed, that, ſome Time ago, you took the Liberty to call me by Name an *Apoſtate Prieſt.* I find the ſame Calumny more publickly repeated in the *Miſcellany* of *Feb.* 15, on a certain Perſon, not named, whoſe Writings have had the Misfortune to diſpleaſe you; and as you are ſaid to be concerned in the furniſhing out this Weekly Paper, in Partnerſhip with another worthy Divine, ſo I cannot avoid conſidering my ſelf as the Object of your Abuſe in both Caſes.

The onely Thing that puzzles me, is to diſcover by what Principle of Chriſtianity you think yourſelf juſtified in ſuch a Licenſe of Calumniating; or how can you imagine a Behaviour ſo ſhocking to good Nature, good Senſe, and good Manners, to be the Effect of any good Religion.

There muſt needs be ſome ſtrange Miſtake between us on one Side or the other. The Word *Religion* perhaps may have ſomething in it equivocal, and denote a quite different Thing with you and with me. If your Religion preſcribes, permits, or does not condemn, all ſuch Defamation as impious and deteſtable, you clear me at once of Apoſtaſy; for that Religion was never mine: And I cannot be charged with deſerting what I had never profeſſed.

Be ſo good, Sir, as to favour me with ſome Account of this Matter. I have a Right, I think, to require at leaſt this Satiſfaction. You are the onely Man who has ventured to call me an Apoſtate; and if you are an honeſt Man, you would not be particular in your Accuſation, without a particular Aſſurance of the Truth of it; nor ſo forward with your Charge, without being as ready with your Proofs. Tell me then, in God's Name, nay, tell the Public all that you know of me: Speak out freely, charge every Thing, that either your own Malice ſuggeſts, or that of others has ſupplied you with. If you can convict me of any Thing immoral or irreligious, of any Apoſtaſy from what is laudable or virtuous, I will take Shame to my ſelf and own it; if not, ſhall ſeek no other Revenge than that of leaving you to the Reproach of your Conſcience, and the Scorn of all good Men.

I could wiſh likewiſe to be informed of what Uſe it can be to the Intereſt of Chriſtianity, of what Advantage to Religion, to proclaim to the World, that I am an Apoſtate. Should your *Miſcellany* fall into the Hands of Men wavering in the Faith, ſtaggering at every Scruple, ſhaken by every Breath of Scandal; and there muſt be many ſuch in this ſceptical Age; might it not be of Weight enough, in the Equilibrium of their Doubts, to turn the Scale on the Infidel Side, to be aſſured by you, that a Clergyman trained in the Boſom of the Church, of ſome Reputation and many Friends, after a Life ſpent in Temperance, Study, and the Search of Truth, had by Choice and Judgement deſerted it? It is the conſtant Policy of all Sects, to challenge to their Party, any Man of Merit, ſuppoſed even on the ſlighteſt Grounds to have diſcovered ſome Inclination to them; but your abſurd Zeal would forcibly drive from the Service of Religion Men of Virtue and Learning, againſt their Will, againſt their Profeſſion, againſt Truth.

The Perſon whom you treat ſo infamouſly, *convinced,* you ſay, *either of his Wickedneſs or Imprudence,* has deſiſted from troubling us further with his Profaneneſs. You allow it then to be a Queſtion, whether it was Wickedneſs or Imprudence, that excited him to write: You allow, that whichſoever it was, he is now convinced, and has deſiſted. This one would think might have induced you to ſuffer a Man to be quiet, who ſuffers every Body elſe to be ſo: He repents, it ſeems; has chang'd his Conduct, troubles No-body; yet all this paſſes for nothing with you; your Charity gives no Quarter: His Repentance muſt be overlooked, his Apoſtaſy always remember'd, and his very Conviction made a Matter of freſh Reproach to him. This is the true Spirit of *Rome,* that never ſpares a Penitent, who returns from Deſertion.

tion. For whilſt you take ſuch Pains to murder a Reputation, ſeeking, according to you, to heal itſelf by Conviction and Amendment, you declare what you would do with Perſons, were they as much in your Power.

But tho' he has deſiſted from troubling us himſelf, yet other Enemies, you ſay, *have refitted their Armour at his Forge; and the witty* Socinian *and crafty* Jeſuit *make great Advantage of his Writings.* And here again, I muſt beg you to tell me, where it is, that theſe Adverſaries are found tampering with his Works; where it is, that we may catch them quoting or building their Errors upon his Principles. If you cannot ſhew this, we muſt take the Inſinuation for another Fiction of your Malice, as ſenſeleſs as it is ſpiteful; a Bolt ſhot out at Random, which by falling ſomewhere luckily may chance to do Miſchief. Is the Growth of Popery to be charged at laſt upon me, who have taken more Pains, and perhaps with more Succeſs, to expoſe its Frauds and Corruptions, than moſt Clergymen now living? Ridiculous Calumny! No, Sir, the *Jeſuits*, I can anſwer for it, will readily join Forces with you; will ſecond your pious Endeavours of wounding my Reputation, ruining my Credit, and defaming me every where as a malicious, profane Apoſtate. It is here, after all, that I am touching the Bottom of the Sore: It was my Piece againſt Popery, that gave the firſt Scandal, and the firſt bad Impreſſion of me. As ſoon as it was publiſhed, that learned Divine, your Partner, happening to meet me in the Street, told me, with a formal Face and Air of Importance, that he had been in Company with certain Friends, who declared themſelves offended at it. I aſked him, Whether they had found any Thing falſe in it? And perceiving that there was no Objection of that Sort, left him with no other Reflection, than that of a juſt Contempt for the Impertinence of the Information. I heard afterwards of another ************

Theſe were the Men, who firſt began the Clamour, and raiſed the firſt Envy upon me; and I am now but paying the Arrears of that old Grudge, as you ſeem to intimate in this very *Miſcellany*:

For

For you ſay, that it was natural for me to hate, what I had before betray'd: As if there was a Guilt upon me, previous to that I have lately been charged with, and the Æra of my Apoſtaſy was to bear the ſame Date with my *Letter* from *Rome*. The more I reflect on your Raſhneſs, the more I am inclin'd to impute it to ſome ſelfiſh Motive of Intereſt; ſome Hopes of Gain or Glory to accrue from it. It is common with the Writers of your Claſs, to run the Riſk of a Pillory, to raiſe the Fame and Value of their Weekly Productions; and we read of an Hero in Antiquity, who ſet the Temple of his Country on Fire, to perpetuate his Name to Poſterity. In this View, you act conſiſtently, tho' in all Views wickedly. But to talk of reforming Morals, and recommending Religion, by a Method deſtructive of all Morality, and contrary to all Religion, is a mere Banter and Affront to Reaſon and common Senſe. But whilſt you diſpenſe ſo freely the Titles of Profane and Apoſtate, let me recommend to you to conſider the Hiſtory of that firſt and chief Apoſtate, the Pattern, as well as Author, of every other Apoſtaſy in the World. You will find his abominable Qualities ſummed up in this ſhort Character, *The Accuſer of the Brethren*, Rev. xii. 10. you will find him deſcribed, as defaming *Day* and *Night*; continually going about roaring and ſeeking to devour. This, ſays St. *John*, *is the old Dragon, which is the Devil and Satan*, Rev. xx. 2. And what, Sir, is the Devil, that is, Satan, but Names drawn from his very Eſſence, ſignifying the Adverſary, the Hater, the Accuſer of Mankind? His Followers, like their Maſter, are deſcribed by *David*, under the Perſon of *Doeg*, *the malicious Accuſer of the Prieſts: With Tongues that deviſe Miſchief; that love devouring Words*, Pſal. lii. 2, 4. *and as Men ſet on Fire, whoſe Teeth are Spears and Arrows, and their Tongues a ſharp Sword*, Pſal. lvii. 4. This is the grand, the ſovereign Apoſtaſy; the Defection from all Religion; a Delight in defaming, an Alacrity in accuſing; and I leave it to you to determine, where the Reproach of it is the moſt likely to fall, on your ſelf or on me. You have called me an *Apoſtate*; all People, I dare ſay, or all at leaſt who know me, will be ſhocked at it: But ſhould I chance to deſcribe a certain Prieſt by the Title of the *Accuſer*, there is ſcarce a Man in *England* who would not immediately think on Mr. VENN. A Reflection ſufficient, methinks, to admoniſh you, that, inſtead of being ſo buſy with other Mens Characters, it behoves you much more to turn your Thoughts and Attention to your own.

But if it be poſſible, after all, that I ſhould ever have it in my Power to ſay of you, what you declare of me, that thro' a Conviction of your Wickedneſs, you had changed your Conduct, and deſiſted from Calumniating; I ſhould ſtill act on this, as I ſhall do on every Occaſion, juſt contrary to the Example you ſet me; I ſhould rejoice in the Change, begin to entertain Hopes and a better Opinion of you, and forget the Accuſer to applaud the Convert.

CONYERS MIDDLETON.

FINIS.